

4224.d  
A  
FULL ANSWER

TO THE

ESSAY on SPIRIT;

*H. Jones (Pr.) Tr. R.S., Vicar of*  
WHEREIN *Hollingbourne*

ALL the Author's Objections, both *scriptural*  
and *philosophical*, to the Doctrine of the  
TRINITY; his Opinions relating to the  
*Uniformity of the Church*; his Criticisms  
upon the *Athanasian and Nicene CREEDS*,  
&c. are examined and confuted.

WITH

A partioular EXPLANATION of the *Hermetic*,  
*Pythagorean*, and *Platonic TRINITIES*:

AND

A PREFACE, giving some account of an Author  
who has lately published in *Defence of the Essay*.

---

*Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see, and  
ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and  
walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls: but  
they said, we will not walk therein. Jerem. vi. 16.*

*Θεου Θετον λεγουσι, και εκ αληθινου. Epiphan. Ancorat.*

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for E. WITHERS at the *Seven Stars*, next the  
*Inner Temple-Gate in Fleet-street*; and S. PARKER  
at Oxford. M.DCC.LIII.

FULL ANSWER

TO THE

ESSAY ON SPIRIT

WHEREIN

All the Author's Objections, Doubts, and  
and Apologies to the Doctrine of the  
Trinity, by the same Author, in the  
University of the City of London,  
upon the 10th of November 1726,  
&c. are explained.



WITH

A PARTICULAR EXPLANATION OF THE  
Mysteries, and Terms, &c.

AND

A PREFACE, giving a short account of an Author  
who has lately published a Treatise of the same

This last and last Edition is in the form of a new  
off for the old Edition, which is the same, and  
well known, and is sold for the same price, but  
they find, we will not waste paper, &c.

One Price, 1s. 6d. per Volume. Printed by

LONDON:

Printed for E. Smith, at the Green Glass, near the  
Royal Exchange, in the Strand, and S. I. Smith,  
at the Old Bailey, MDCCLXXII.



---

To the REVEREND  
*Sir John Dolben, Bart. D. D.*  
AND  
Prebendary of *DURHAM.*

*Reverend Sir !*

**A**S my situation renders me, in some measure, accountable to you for the use I make of my leisure hours, it is natural for me to seek your favour and protection with regard to the following papers ; your kind acceptance of which, will not be imputed to any merit of theirs, but entirely to that well-conducted zeal and unreserved condescension, which will not suffer you to despise even the meanest efforts, where they are intended to promote the honour of God, or the welfare of mankind.

But I have many other reasons, Sir, for prefixing your name to the following pages; from which, the motive already-mentioned borrowed its chief and more especial influence: for I am fully sensible, that your character and station in the Church, your firm attachment to, and experienced knowledge of, the Holy Scriptures, your familiar acquaintance with Antiquity, both sacred and profane, and your unblemished life (the best recommendation of every other excellence) will reconcile my readers, be they more or less, to whatever you shall be pleased in any degree to approve; and effectually remove those natural prejudices, which otherways might be conceived, as well against my years, as against the name of a person so unknown to the world.

I ought indeed to make some apology for presenting a piece of the controversial sort, to one who esteems it a far greater benefit to *believe*,  
 than

than an entertainment to *dispute* ; and whose temper is too serene and harmonized to have much relish for the noise and discord of a controversy : but the importance and dignity of that divine truth, which I have humbly endeavoured to assert and vindicate, as it will justify me to the world, so will it likewise recommend me to your attention ; be the form of my work either smooth and declamatory, or, as at present it is obliged to be, rugged and disputatious.

I am so far, Sir, from taking any pleasure in thrusting myself into a public controversy, (and indeed my talents are rather fitted for retirement and obscurity) that it would give me a much greater satisfaction to behold them that *confess God's holy name, agreeing in the truth of his holy word*, than to be capable of writing the most learned refutation of one that opposes or contradicts it : to see the church of *Christ* in possession.

possession of that peace, which he himself bequeathed to it, than to obtain the most compleat victory over one of its adversaries.

But so many unreasonable demands, Sir, are made upon us, some of them even by men of our own order, that our state is, and must be, militant. Peace, under these circumstances, is not to be obtained, but by making the most unlimited concessions, and bringing the christian faith down to their size, whom we cannot persuade to come up to it.

A treaty of coalition, proposed upon such terms as these, will, I trust in God, never be submitted to by the legislative powers of this realm: I believe, and am persuaded, that it will not: and those writers, who solicit them to the repealing of any article, supported by the undoubted warrant of divine writ, pay so mean a compliment to their understanding, as well as to  
 3  
 their



their Faith, that they will, I dare say, reject it with a just and suitable indignation.

As for the manner in which I have treated the subjects that have occurred to me, I forbear to say any thing either by way of excuse or recommendation; taking it for granted, Sir, that as your learning and judgment, on the one hand, are not to be bribed by the tedious apologies of a petitionary writer; so your unaffected candour and humanity, on the other, will naturally dispose you to make every just and favourable allowance. And though I am not so presuming as to expect, that what I have now offered should be found sufficient to remove every objection, and clear every difficulty; yet I am encouraged to hope, it will at least be accepted (by you, Sir, I am sure it will) as the sincere testimony of one, who aspires to no higher character, than that of an humble Claimant in behalf of our religion,

possession of that peace, which he himself bequeathed to it, than to obtain the most compleat victory over one of its adversaries.

But so many unreasonable demands, Sir, are made upon us, some of them even by men of our own order, that our state is, and must be, militant. Peace, under these circumstances, is not to be obtained, but by making the most unlimited concessions, and bringing the christian faith down to their size, whom we cannot persuade to come up to it.

A treaty of coalition, proposed upon such terms as these, will, I trust in God, never be submitted to by the legislative powers of this realm: I believe, and am persuaded, that it will not: and those writers, who solicit them to the repealing of any article, supported by the undoubted warrant of divine writ, pay so mean a compliment to their understanding, as well as to  
 304  
 their

their Faith, that they will, I dare say, reject it with a just and suitable indignation.

As for the manner in which I have treated the subjects that have occurred to me, I forbear to say any thing either by way of excuse or recommendation; taking it for granted, Sir, that as your learning and judgment, on the one hand, are not to be bribed by the tedious apologies of a petitionary writer; so your unaffected candour and humanity, on the other, will naturally dispose you to make every just and favourable allowance. And though I am not so presuming as to expect, that what I have now offered should be found sufficient to remove every objection, and clear every difficulty; yet I am encouraged to hope, it will at least be accepted (by you, Sir, I am sure it will) as the sincere testimony of one, who aspires to no higher character, than that of an humble Claimant in behalf of our religion,

religion, and an hearty well-wisher  
to our constitution; and who gladly  
takes this opportunity of professing  
himself to be, with the most un-  
feigned respect and veneration,

REVEREND SIR,

*Your most obliged,*

*Most obedient,*

*And very faithful Servant,*

Finedon,  
March 25, 1753.

WILLIAM JONES.



## P R E F A C E.

**I**T was not my intention to trouble or detain the reader with a preface; but some time after the following sheets were ready for the press, a pamphlet came forth with this title—*A defence of the Essay on Spirit; with remarks on the several pretended Answers; and which may serve as an antidote against all that shall ever appear against it.*—If the book itself should really be able to support such a Title-page, and be found answerable to the latter part of it, my labour can avail but little. I think, however, that I may be pretty secure of its making any impression to my disadvantage, as the author of it, in the first place, does not seem rightly to understand the very scope and design of the piece he has undertaken to *defend*.

He tells us, that the author of the *Essay's* "whole book seems *only* intended, (not to enforce any explanations of his own,) but to shew how ineffectual all attempts to explain this mystery (the doctrine of the Trinity) have been hitherto." Now, if he has enforced *no*

b

expla-

\* Defence, p. 5.

explanations of his own, then it would be impossible for me to extract and produce them: but the substance of them, in short, is as follows:—The person of the *Father* only, is the *one supreme intelligent Agent*: the *Son*, and *Holy Spirit* are not really God, but *called so*, because, by an authority communicated to them from the Supreme, they are commissioned to ACT AS GODS with regard to those inferior beings committed to their charge.<sup>b</sup>—And so far is the *Essay*-writer from endeavouring to exclude every explanation, that his whole book is principally calculated for the support of *this*.

Let it also be considered, that in the *dedication* prefixed to his *Essay*, he hopes that “his” “sentiments will by gentle degrees come, by” “the blessing of God, to be made a part of” “the established religion of the country.”<sup>c</sup> If therefore, as it is asserted in the *Defence*, he has enforced *no* explanation of the Trinity; and it is nevertheless hoped in the *Essay*, that *his sentiments* will be made a part of the established religion; this is in effect to hope, that *Nothing* (by the blessing of God) will be established as a fundamental of the christian faith. So that this Gentleman, instead of *defending* the *Essay*, seems to have defeated its principal intention, misrepresented its author, and reduced his whole book to an absurdity.

Another

<sup>b</sup> See chap. V. of the following *Answer*. <sup>c</sup> P. 51.

Another method of this writer, almost as hurtful to the cause he has undertaken as the former, is to assert what he cannot possibly know to be true, even supposing it were so, and what the world must know to be false. A justly celebrated discourse upon the Trinity, written by the late dean *Swift*, has, upon the publication of the *Essay*, and to prevent in some measure (as the *Editor* expresses himself) the evil effects of that treatise, been reprinted in *Ireland*. This discourse, the author now before us has assaulted with a great degree of prejudice and animosity; and after he has sifted some absurd and contradictory senses out of its expressions, and treated his lordship of *Orrery*, and other able and learned gentlemen, with great contempt for not having *skill enough* to make the same discovery, confidently affirms, that he has “ shewn the *Dean* to “ have been an *Arian* in his heart.”<sup>d</sup> Now, if the *Dean* has been so unhappy in his expressions, as to subscribe himself an *Arian*, while he meant to declare himself a *Catholic*, he must surely have wanted common sense, a defect, which (in his day) he was farther from than most men living: if in his expressions he appears to be *orthodox*, and yet was, in the *secrets of his heart*, an *Arian*; this author must pretend to some degree of omniscience in being able to find it out.

As a specimen of his comments upon the Holy Scripture, I may set down the evidence he has alledged in favour of angel-worship.

The *Arians* have always been greatly distressed to justify the adoration they allow to the second and third persons of the Blessed Trinity, while at the same time they degrade them down to the rank of created beings. It is therefore presumed in the *Essay*, that the worship of angels can be no idolatry, because it *terminates in the one only and true God*: to which a certain author. has very judiciously replied—"yet it seems, in " *St. Paul's* style, being idolatrous, and *doing* " (religious) *service to them which by nature are* " *no Gods*, are synonymous expressions." But here, the author of the *Defence*, in order to avoid the conflict in which he seems apprehensive of a defeat, "cannot but lament the ill treatment the " scriptures of truth meet with, when they light " into indiscreet hands, who catch at a single " verse, which without considering *the context*, " they *wrest* to their own purposes: for in those " words of *St. Paul*, the crime is, *serving them* " *which are not Gods by nature*, without a commission from God for so doing; by which " means, the service did not terminate in the " one only and true God." <sup>f</sup>.

That

\* Of an article published in the *Dublin Literary Journal* for December 1751.

<sup>f</sup> Page 13.



That there are, in the world, men *unlearned* and *unstable*, who bend and accommodate the scriptures to serve some private purpose of their own, is a lamentable truth, which every serious Inquirer will be ready enough to confess: and the reader, I am sure, will agree with me, that the remark I have just now transcribed, is likely to afford us a most ample confirmation of it: for after this pathetic exclamation against ill treatment, indiscreet hands, and a disregard to the context, the verse itself contains an argument full and clear, and the disregarded context—*without a commission from God for so doing*—which gives a contrary turn, or, a *wrest* to the whole, is not St. Paul's, but *his own*.

If the crime of the Heathens in worshipping their idols, consisted (according to this author's state of the case) only in a want of commission; then he must suppose it possible, for God to authorize that very crime, against which he hath pronounced the most extreme vengeance and malediction, the very *abomination that he hateth*,<sup>†</sup> for the adoration of the creature, to redound to the glory of the Creator; and for the worship of an idol, the stump of a tree, to *terminate in the only and true God*.

I will in this place take the liberty of propounding the following short remark: that as it appears,

<sup>†</sup> Deut. xii. 31. See chap. xxviii. 14, &c.

appears from the text of St. Paul above-cited, we are to worship those only who are (ΦΥΣΕΙ ΘΕΟΣ) *Gods by nature*; and as all the primitive ecclesiastical writers, in their application of the term φύσις, *essence*, make it synonymous with φύσις, *nature*,<sup>b</sup> it may, I humbly conceive, be inferred from hence, that the *Homoeousian* doctrine, for the sake of which the *Arians* would reject both the *Athanasian* and *Nicene* creeds, is scriptural in its term, as well as in its sense. For, if we are to worship the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, as the *Arians* themselves are forced to confess, they must be *God by NATURE*, ομοουσιον, *of the same essence or nature* with God the Father; if not, the adoration we pay to them must include us in that sentence of condemnation passed upon the idolatrous Gentiles. But to return to the author, whose manner of reasoning I shall, in the next place, take some notice of.

Dean Swift tells us in his Sermon, that “about three hundred years after Christ, there sprang up an heresy, of people called *Arians* from one *Arius* the leader of them: these (says he) denied our Saviour to be God;” where the author immediately replies — “than which nothing can be more false; for they did acknowledge him to be God.”<sup>i</sup>

Here

<sup>b</sup> Ἰδού, οτι φύσις καὶ φύσις ταυτὴν εἰς παρὰ τοῖς πατέρεσσιν. Notandum est, *essentiam & naturam idem esse apud Patres.* Leont. de Sect. p. 308.

<sup>i</sup> Page 22,

Here the reader should be informed, that this Gentleman has *two* definitions of a God: by the first, there is a *supreme* and *true* God; by the second, a subordinate and nominal God, who only *acts as* such, of which sort he says there may be *three hundred*.<sup>\*</sup> Tell him, that the *Arians* denied our Saviour to be God, and he can boldly renounce the charge: but then, it is with a secret view to the *second* definition, when the charge plainly proceeds against them only with a respect to the *first*, and when the first alone can have either sense or truth in it.

Where he cannot disprove any thing, he puzzles and perplexes the whole cause, and by interweaving a proportionable quantity of falshood, renders a question, in every view of it, unintelligible; and so far he is certainly in the right; for error is not to be advanced either by truth or perspicuity. In pursuance of this plan, he confounds the *Consubstantialists* (that is, the *catholic Christians*) with the *Sabellians*, and *vice versa* the *Sabellians* with the *Consubstantialists*, in the following manner—"The *Consubstantialists* and the "*Sabellians*" (says he) agree *exactly* in their "*opinion* of the indivisible unity of the substance of God between the *three Persons* of the "*Trinity*." Which is impossible to be true; For if the *Sabellians* agreed *exactly* in this matter with

<sup>\*</sup> Page 44.

<sup>\*</sup> Page 27, 28.



with the *Catholics*, they must then have maintained that there *were* three Persons in the Trinity, between whom this indivisible union might subsist: but on the contrary, they affirmed the whole Godhead to be *μία ὑποστάσις*, or *μονοπροσωπος*,<sup>m</sup> only ONE *hypostasis* or *Person*.

Again: "When the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit," says he, "are declared by the *Athanasians* to be the same one undivided Person in reality; I own I do not see any difference between that and the doctrine of *Sabellius*."<sup>n</sup> First, he makes the *Sabellians* assert *three* Persons in the Godhead, who never allowed more than *one*; then, makes the *Athanasians* allow but *one* Person, who always asserted *three*; and then solemnly declares—that he sees no difference between their doctrines! Let me desire this Gentleman, for God's sake, to reflect a while on the notorious falsties advanced in his book, of which I could produce *many* more instances. If he should condescend to do this, at my earnest request, I would then recommend to him a comparison between *Rev.* ii. 2. and *xxi.* 8. being willing to hope, that those texts, when laid together and considered, may have such a profitable influence upon his heart, as to induce him to alter his style, and favour us with a piece rather more chastised and correct, if ever he should appear again in the capacity of an author.

<sup>m</sup> See *Epiphan.* v. 2. p. 513.

<sup>n</sup> Page 42, 43.



I cannot observe in a more proper place, that he threatens the world with a treatise, whence it will “ appear, that that part of our Ecclesiastical “ History, which relates to the dispute between “ the *Arians* and *Athanasians*, is little better than “ an heap of falsities and forgeries.” °. For I apprehend that the forgeries above-mentioned may enable the reader to conceive, not an unjust idea, of an *Arian* turned *Historian*: If these are not sufficient, let him attentively peruse the author’s whole book; and if that will not do, let me beseech him to consider that account the most excellent and learned bishop *Bull* has given of *Christoph. Sandius’s Nucleus Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ—copiosissimâ fabularum & contradictionum accessione locupletatus—*<sup>p</sup> and I am persuaded he will then be upon his guard against every historical tract which comes from *that* quarter.

I shall now remark (and in truth I am almost tired of remarking) his rashness in censuring what, it is plain, he has not properly considered. The celebrated and learned Dr. *Stebbing*, in a quotation this author has made from him, says, “ How three, as distinct in point of *agency*, as “ *Peter, James, and John*, should by one common principle of existence, be one eternal “ God; this exceeds the measure of our finite “ under

° Page 40.      <sup>p</sup> Def. Fid. Nic. Procem. §. 6. See also Pages 69, 121, 229, & alibi sparsim. — The *Irenicum Irenicorum* is another history of the same complexion with *Sandius*.

“ understandings to comprehend : yet it is not  
 “ therefore a contradiction ; yet it is not there-  
 “ fore incredible.” Which observation, though  
 common, is yet very pious, well expressed, and  
 worthy of the Gentleman that made it. But,  
 says our author, “ If the Doctor had but inserted  
 “ any one noun-substantive after the adjective  
 “ *three*, which he, (as all the *Albanasians* care-  
 “ fully do,) has *disingenuously* omitted, and with-  
 “ out which the whole sentence is *nonsense*\*, he  
 “ could not have avoided seeing the contradic-  
 “ tion, as well as pointing it out to others<sup>1</sup>.”  
 The noun-substantive inserted by the church upon  
 this occasion, is the word *Persons* : and the most  
 free and dispassionate enquirer can perceive no  
 contradiction in saying, that the blessed Trinity  
 are three *Persons*, and one *God* ; three and one,  
 in different respects ; three, in respect of their  
*personality*, and one in respect of their *divine na-*  
*ture*, or, as Dr. Stebbing has worded it, their  
*common principle of existence*. To say, either that  
 they are three Persons and one Person, or, three  
 Gods and one God, would be to suppose them  
 three and one, in one and the same respect, and  
 would indeed amount to a contradiction in terms ;  
 which is the very thing this author has made of  
 it : “ for, adds he, “ every one, who is not out  
 “ of his senses, must see, that affirming *three*  
 “ *eternal*

\* He elsewhere says of this expression, that it is — non-  
 sense artfully cloathing itself, that it may look something like  
 sense.

<sup>1</sup> P. 34, 35.

“ *eternal Gods to be one eternal God, is a contradiction*.” Very true : and I hope no man that is *in his senses*, when writing upon such a subject as this, would dare to *make* a contradiction, where he did not find one. But I must press this point a little farther : for it is observable, that the very same omission of the noun-substantive, and where the very same sense is expressed too, occurs in the *inspired writings* : Οἱ τρεῖς ἑν, ΤΡΕΙΣ, ΕΝ ἑστὶ, *These THREE are ONE* — so that this bold accusation of *disingenuity, nonsense*, and something worse, alledged at first against Dr. *Stebbing*, will, when carried forwards, be at last fixed upon Him — whose name I dare not mention upon such occasion.

In order to give a proper account of the *antidote*, and enable the reader, as well as I can, to comprehend the force and propriety of it, it will be requisite to premise a few of the author's principles, as they are to be collected from that part of his book, which precedes what is called in the Title-page — *An antidote against all that shall ever appear against the Essay on Spirit.*

The author of the *Defence* then, declares against all the *decrees of councils and doctrines of men* ; advises *metaphysical divines to forbear their own comments* ; and will suffer nothing but *clear and express revelation* to determine *him* with regard to any article of moment. And yet, in express

C 2

con-

\* P. 34, 35.

\* P. 3.

\* Ibid.

\* P. 4, 50, 79.



contradiction to all this, the ingredients of his *antidote*, which is to preclude all future controversies, to determine the question for ever on the *Arian* side, and (as its very name implies) to *expel* the *poison* of orthodoxy, are nothing more than a quotation from *Justin Martyr* <sup>v</sup>, and another from the *Gentleman's Religion* <sup>x</sup>; the former a very obscure *metaphysical comment*, the latter a groundless and unsupported assertion. If we had not ocular demonstration for this, it would seem altogether incredible, that the same author who has rejected all *human comments*, and set at naught *all the councils in Christendom* <sup>y</sup>, should think himself secure under the shelter of that very authority, nay, under a small and insignificant portion of it, the whole of which he has made it his business to vilify and contemn. Had he been more consistent with himself, and proposed his quotation from *Justin Martyr* with the sobriety that might have been expected, I should then have attempted to shew with the same sobriety, that it contains *the indivisible union of the Son with the substance of the Father*; though blended, as I freely confess, with some perplexed and metaphysical reasonings, which indeed are reconcilable to the principles of *Plato*, but not to those of the *Holy Scripture*. However, as he has introduced it in such a manner as to render it repugnant to his own principles, and therefore incapable of doing  
his

<sup>v</sup> P. 54 to 78.

<sup>x</sup> 79 to 82.

<sup>y</sup> P. 29.



his cause the least service (be the doctrine of it this or that) I shall not try to give the reader any edification or amusement by a critical discussion of a very long passage, unlikely to afford either.

But I must not throw his book aside, without giving some short account of his language; I mean, of his candour, humility, and charity; which virtues are as much disregarded in the *Defence* (if that be possible) as they are recommended in the *Essay*.

The gentlemen who have advised the Reverend author of the *Essay* to resign his preferment; that is, in effect, to appease his conscience, retract his subscription, and cease to disturb the peace of the church with his own private scruples; he upbraids with a *spirit of persecution and ignorance*<sup>2</sup>: which is not more unkind than it is untrue and injudicious. For, on the contrary, those restless and discontented men, that have esteemed the doctrines and authority of the church to be an intolerable burden, and undertaken to supplant its truth by a surreptitious introduction of their own errors, (whatever specious appearances of candour and moderation they might at first assume in *proposing* them) have in fact, when affairs have taken an unhappy turn, themselves proved the most lawless persecutors and merciless oppressors of all *civil and religious liberty*<sup>2</sup>.

And

<sup>2</sup> P. 52.

<sup>2</sup> See the short extract made in the following pages from Mr. *Echard's Hist. of England*.

And I leave it to be considered, whether the spirit that has discovered itself in the *Defence*, were it permitted to have its full play, might not bid fair for an imitation of them. Besides, how inconsistent is it, first to tell us that our doctrines and subscriptions are such as must drive all men of sense and honesty (such as the author is) out of the church<sup>b</sup>; and then, when we ground a slight admonition upon his own principle, to turn short upon us with the stale pretences of popery! persecution! St. Dominic! Bishop Bonner! fire! fagot, &c.<sup>c</sup>!

Dean Swift he calls a Goliath of Gath, sent out (by the republication of his sermon in Ireland) to defy the armies of the living God; and thinks he has flung a few round pebbles of arguments so directly in his face, as to make him lie prostrate upon the ground<sup>d</sup>. Which unnatural application of the Scripture-history gives us a taste of his charity, and shews, that in his opinion the Arians are the elect people of God, the true Israelites, whilst all the opposers of their doctrine (which I hope includes every good christian in the nation) are uncircumcised Philistines, infidels, idolaters, and in professed rebellion against the living God.

The orthodox Clergy in general, he reviles as a set of cloudy, bigotted, indolent men, who,  
if

<sup>b</sup> P. 52.<sup>c</sup> Ibid.<sup>d</sup> P. 21. and 53.

if they can but preserve their subscriptions and good livings, care not what becomes of Christianity<sup>a</sup>; because they have not wrote an answer (or had not at least when his book was published) to the late Lord Bolingbroke's objections; and unless he *bas written one himself*, it is unfair to make this a pretence for insulting them.

The learned gentlemen that have appeared in print against the *Essay*, he calls, collectors of cavils<sup>f</sup>, orthodox gentry<sup>g</sup>, men that neither understand the dispute, nor any thing else<sup>h</sup>, their own trumpeters<sup>i</sup>, minor scribblers<sup>k</sup>, animals<sup>l</sup>, buzzing insects<sup>m</sup>, hard heads<sup>n</sup>, &c. &c. charges the grave and learned Dr. Stebbing with wilful nonsense, the whole church with blasphemy<sup>o</sup>: then wipes his mouth, and desires that if any body should undertake to answer the *Essay on Spirit*, they will do it with — *Christian candour and moderation*<sup>p</sup>!

From this view of things, we cannot but conceive a proper opinion both of the talents and the spirit of this author; whom, in truth, it has given me much less pleasure to expose, than concern that there was occasion for it. And now, if this *Defence* was written by the author of the *Essay*, what an amazing change of character is here! In the *Essay* it is — *Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*<sup>q</sup>. — *That principle which directs*

<sup>a</sup> P. 52, 53.<sup>h</sup> P. 15.<sup>m</sup> P. 51.<sup>p</sup> P. 52.<sup>f</sup> P. 2.<sup>i</sup> 17.<sup>n</sup> 52.<sup>q</sup> Ded. p. 35.<sup>g</sup> P. 19. and 53.<sup>k</sup> P. 51.<sup>o</sup> P. 10, 44.<sup>l</sup> 52.

*vide*  
*Worburn*

*directs us to use all men well, can never vindicate us in using any man ill* \*. — And again — *were it, not that experience convinces us of the matter of fact, it would be* HARD TO BELIEVE *that mens passions could carry them to that degree of animosity against each other, on account of opinions* BARELY SPECULATIVE (such as the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity is supposed to be, and upon which the dispute has turned in *the Defence*) *which we find practised in all countries, and almost in all ages* \*. There the ruling principle is an universal love and affection, that makes charitable allowances for every sect of men in the world ; extending even to *Hereticks, Infidels, Jews and Mahometans* ; and lavishly dispensing, as from the papal chair, its indulgences to every error under heaven. But *here* (in the *Defence*) a very different passion is predominant ; so far from making allowances in favour of *error*, that it cannot bear even the least degree of opposition from the sincere advocates of the *truth* ; but vents itself in wilful forgeries, contempt, calumny, and all the overflowings of an enraged malevolence. Whether the *Essay* and the *Defence* therefore came both from the same hand (though it is suspected they did) I shall not take upon me to determine ; since it is almost impossible to believe, that these different passions, so diametrically opposite to each other, can ever reside in the same breast.

But

\* Ded. p. 35.

\* *Ibid.* p. 33.



But since it plainly appears, that authors of the *Arian* persuasion can write (as occasion shall serve) with two very different tempers; I must beg leave to mention, that if any learned gentleman, who is of their opinion, should think so inconsiderable a writer as I am worth his notice, and fairly propose his objections to any part of the following work with sense and argument, I shall be ready, with God's leave, to give him satisfaction to the best of my abilities, and with seriousness and sobriety. But if any writer should unfortunately fix upon the same plan with the author of this *Defence*, and persuade himself that he can invalidate my arguments by setting me down for an *animal*, a *buzzing insect*, or an *hard head*, I can easily forgive him, but must be excused from making any reply.

If I myself should unawares have been hurried on by a warm'd imagination to any degree of that extravagance which I have blamed in others, I am ready on the slightest admonition to retract it; and do heartily assure the ingenuous and *christian* reader, that if, in the course of the succeeding pages, it should appear that any unjust strictures have escaped me, any small attempts at wit or ridicule, which may give the least reasonable offence to him, they shall no longer have any approbation from me.

What I have offered in relation to the *Heathen Trinities*\*, I would recommend to the consideration of the learned; not by way of *instructing* them, I pretend to no such thing, but rather, that they who are better enabled to judge of it than I am, may try how far such a *physical* explanation of the heathen *mythology* will go; and I desire not that any greater weight should be laid upon it, than by a temperate and regular application it will be found to bear. In my *first chapter*, where I have frequently taken an occasion of referring to the *physics* of the most ancient heathens, I have dropt a short hint of some resemblance between their natural philosophy, and the *physical part* of Sir *Isaac Newton's* works. If the judicious and inquisitive reader should think it worth pursuing, he may perhaps see it abundantly confirmed by comparing the few quotations I have there made from the heathen books (which, had there been occasion, might have been greatly multiplied) with what has lately been advanced by my learned and ingenious friend Mr. *Horne*, Fellow of *Magdalen College* in *Oxford*, entitled—*A fair and impartial State of the Case*, &c. a work, which as far as it has yet had time to circulate, seems to be receiv'd with general approbation. 6 JY 59

A

FULL ANSWER

TO THE

ESSAY on SPIRIT.



ESSAY ON SPIRIT

E

lin

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"



---

A N  
A N S W E R  
T O T H E  
E S S A Y o n S P I R I T.

**T**HE author of this *essay* addresses his *dedication* to the Lord-primate of *Ireland*, and sets out with telling his Grace, that “ as a clergyman, he  
 “ was obliged to subscribe the articles of  
 “ our religion, and give his assent to all  
 “ things contained in the *Book of Common*  
 “ *Prayer* ; but since that time, having  
 “ *thought*, as well as *read*, he finds that he  
 “ does not now agree *exactly* in sentiment  
 “ either with his *former opinions*, or with  
 “ those persons who drew up the articles of  
 “ our religion, or with the compilers of our  
 “ Liturgy, and in particular with the *Atha-*  
 “ *nasian Creed* ; and therefore he has la-  
 B “ boured

“boured under some difficulties how to direct himself in these circumstances.”

It appears then, that this gentleman, before he subscribed the articles, did *read*, but not *think*; and yet, that what he then thought to be true (for he acknowledges a *former opinion*) he now thinks to be false. Therefore, as he entered upon an ecclesiastical preferment, because he thought the articles true, by thinking otherwise, he hath discharged himself from the obligation of keeping that preferment, whatever it be, any longer in possession. I should suppose then, that he might without much difficulty *direct himself properly* under these circumstances; since nothing hinders him from giving up his preferment, if he so strongly objects to that title, or rather, to those conditions, upon which he holds it. He confesses, that he now differs in opinion from his former-self; from the bishops who drew up our articles in conformity to the word of scripture; from those who in this age are subscribers to the faith; in short, he confesses that the whole establish'd church is against him. Now he cannot surely be so unmerciful to our consciences, as to expect,

that we shall disregard all these authorities; go contrary to the sense of the church in all ages; and calmly give up our faith and doctrine, in compliance with the opinion of one single person, who, not many years ago, was of a different opinion; and is, I presume, but lately come to his present opinion: which is to suppose, that the truth of Christianity depends upon opinion; and that its very leading article, the doctrine of the Trinity, may be this or that, just as a wavering mind happens to *think*.

That uncertainty in which this author hath involved himself, inclines him to *apprehend any attempt towards avoiding diversity of opinions, not only to be an useless, but also an impracticable scheme*. As long as men will *lean to their own understandings*, in contempt of that divine rule by which they are to be directed, I grant it to be *impracticable*; they will then *believe a lie*, and *have pleasure in their own unrighteous imaginations*. But we must distinguish between *faith and opinion*; since no faith can be genuine, but when regulated by the word of God, in which we can find no authority or

- B 2

indulgence

indulgence for a man's *thinking* just as he pleases, where God has determined the point for him. Every attempt therefore towards reducing Christian men to an unity of faith, is laudable, pious, and useful; for there is *one* faith, and *one* Lord, who ceases to be one and the same to *us*, so long as we have different opinions about him. And I cannot but hope that this scheme is in a great measure practicable, since the principal testimony which our Lord requires us to give the world of the truth we hold, is, to *love one another*; for the effecting of which, an unity of sentiment, touching matters of true religion, is absolutely necessary.

The author is fond of representing an unity of sentiment, as a thing altogether impracticable, substituting (as before) the word *opinion* instead of *faith*, and is in doubt *whether any two thinking men are agreed exactly in their opinions*. Let them who oppose their own conjectural systems to the express word of scripture, let them, I say, look to that: for the observation hath little or no concern with those, who *bring every thought into captivity to the obedience*  
of



*of Christ*; whose word, like its divine author, is perfect and unchangeable, however *thinking men* may err in their comments upon it.

Thus much for the disagreements of *thinking men*; from whom the *author* makes a transition to what he calls, the *unthinking*, and observes, that *whatever country you go into, let the religion be what it will, the unthinking part are always the reputed orthodox*<sup>c</sup>. A truly christian account of the holy catholic church! which, it seems, is compos'd of nothing but men who *think*, but do not *agree*; and men who *agree*, but do not *think*. I would ask this gentleman, from whom the *unthinking herd*<sup>d</sup> of this nation derive the faith now established in our creeds and articles? for if they did not also derive it from *another* unthinking herd, nothing suitable to his purpose can be inferred from their orthodoxy. But they derive it, thro' the ministration of the Apostles and their successors, from *Christ*; therefore the *herd*, whether thinking or unthinking, can, as orthodox, be charged with nothing, but what, if carried far enough backwards, will

<sup>c</sup> P. 7.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid.

will equally hold good against *Christ* and his apostles.

However, we may boldly challenge him to *prove* the *orthodox*, an *unthinking herd*; because the men, who chiefly set themselves forth as orthodox, are those who solemnly subscribe their unfeigned assent to the orthodox faith, I mean, the clergy of the nation; who from the discipline they undergo before they are called upon to give this proof of their orthodoxy, are supposed, at least, to be men of some discernment in matters of christian doctrine and human literature. These then are the *unthinking herd*, thus reflected upon; and, for the author to represent his clerical brethren as a beastly, illiterate rabble, is not quite so handsome. But neither will the subject bear to be inverted; for it is not altogether so clear, that ignorance, and thoughtlessness, will preserve an apparent pretence to orthodoxy among the vulgar; rather the contrary. For most of those sectaries which have rejected orthodoxy, and look upon the glad and humble professors of it, in the light that *Milton* represents the *Devil* to have done upon *Gabriel*,

*bril*<sup>a</sup>, have generally sprung from the root of ignorance; which, when nourished by a proper degree of pride, is always productive of error.

The *Quakers*, for example, arose from the ever memorable *George Fox*, a mean and ignorant mechanick, that could hardly spell his own name; but with bloody invectives against *Baal's priests*, *execrable hierlings*, *devil-driven Judases*, with which, and many more such soft appellations, his lamb-like spirit honoured all the ministers of Christ, was enabled to draw away the unlearned, and unstable, into the very sink of error and delusion. Now, if *to think*, be to substitute heterodoxy, and a lying spirit in the place of sound faith and the spirit of truth, the author may behold *George Fox* and his adherents, claiming the chief seat in the synagogue of *thinkers*; and if he still professes to *think*, in this sense, it may not be an unprofitable mortification to him, to see how much nearer the *thinking herd* approach to brutality, than those whom he  
is

<sup>a</sup> Proud *limitary* cherub! Par. lost. B. 4. 969. Had Satan been speaking to one of the orthodox, instead of *limitary*, he would have said, I suppose—*pacing in the trams of the Church*. See *Middleton's Free Enquiry*.

is pleased to sneer for slavishly embracing the *creed of their fathers*.

He allows, indeed, that an *uniformity of profession may be both practicable and useful; and that it seems in some degree necessary—for the good of society*<sup>†</sup>. In this, if I am not so unhappy as to misunderstand him, he levels the christian religion down to a political scheme, calculated for the preservation of peace, or the *outward forms of society*<sup>‡</sup>, and intended only to make men hang together like a swarm of bees, which at the end of the summer, are to be smoaked out and buried in the earth. But the essential worth of the christian faith, is its great promise not only of this life, but of *that which is to come*. The *good of society*, without any thing farther, must sound very flat and dead in the ears of one, whose *hopes are full of immortality*; and is seldom recommended merely of itself, but by your little philosophical dabblers, who either disbelieve the resurrection, or think themselves no way interested in the expectation of it.

If an *uniformity of profession* be all that is necessary, and if even this be no farther necessary, than for the preservation of peace, then

<sup>†</sup> Ibid.

<sup>‡</sup> P. 9.



then any national religion, established and agreed upon by compact and consent, would answer the end as well; since the external regulation of society would not, in this case, depend upon the *kind* or *quality* of the religion, but upon the *uniformity* with which it is *professed*. What a shocking position is here! however, I believe, it may be matched with another or two, so much resembling it, that though they differ somewhat in expression, yet the sentiments are the same; and these from the celebrated Dr. *Middleton*, who in his spiteful letter to Dr. *Waterland*<sup>b</sup> has the following grave remark upon the *immorality* of *Tindal's* scheme. “ Should  
 “ he then gain his end, and actually demo-  
 “ lish *christianity*, what would be the con-  
 “ sequence; what the fruit of his labours,  
 “ but confusion and disorder, till some other  
 “ *traditional religion* could be settled in its  
 “ place; till we had *agreed* to recal either  
 “ the gods of the *old world*, *Jupiter*, *Mi-*  
 “ *nerva*, *Venus*, &c. or with the idolaters  
 “ of the *new*, to worship *sun*, *moon*, and  
 “ *stars*; or instead of *Jesus*, take *Mahomet*  
 “ or *Confucius*, for the *author of our faith*?”  
 and to the same purpose, p. 55. “ but should

C

we

“ we consider it (*christianity*) as the *best of*  
 “ *all other religions*, the best contrived to  
 “ promote *publick peace* and the good of so-  
 “ *ciety*—then his crime will be aggravated  
 “ in proportion—since as is said above, some  
 “ *traditional religion* or other must take  
 “ place, as necessary to keep the world in  
 “ order.”

I shall dismiss these impious tenets, with observing briefly, that a political agreement in the idolatrous republics of *Rome* and *Athens*, and peace and union under Christ in the *household of faith*, are things entirely different both in their nature and in their consequences; the former being built upon spurious and worldly principles, calculated to promote a transitory earth-born glory, and prevent men from cutting one anothers throats; though the principles they went upon often made them do it, and were productive, just as it happened, either of order, peace, and agreement, or of anarchy, disorder, and bloodshed. The latter depends upon an *uniformity of saving faith*, revealed in mercy to lost mankind, by the righteous judge of all the earth, and sown in the hearts of the meek and lowly, enabling them

them to bring forth those uniform and genuine fruits of love and charity to their fellow-redeemed, which will entitle them, as a nation, to the protection of God in this life, and at length give them a place amidst the glorious assembly of the first born, in the regions of everlasting bliss and immortality. Such is the difference between his little plea of temporary peace, and an uniform participation of the means of grace in the church of Christ.

But it was his interest to make an *uniformity of belief*, a matter so slight and trivial; or if of any consequence, a scheme quite impracticable, and to recommend instead of it an *uniformity of profession* only, that his readers might be the better prepared to receive his opinion concerning *subscriptions*: for as it is his most explicit purpose flatly to deny the consubstantiality, and co-eternity of the ever blessed Trinity, to which doctrines, as they now stand in our creeds and articles, he hath by a subscription declared his *unfeigned assent*; it must alarm the honest part of his readers, and put them upon enquiring, what method he has found of quieting his conscience? Why, truly, a

very odd one; for it is his opinion, that *a man, for prudential reasons, may honestly subscribe and submit to the use of one established form, though he in his private opinion may think another to be better*<sup>i</sup>; and as for such of his brethren who differ from him, they consider subscriptions in the same light with the bigotted members of the church of Rome<sup>k</sup>.

But, soft and fair, Sir; we must not nauseate moral honesty or christian fidelity, because a fanciful person is pleased to stigmatize such parts of it with the name of popery, as really have nothing to do with popery; or if at all concerned with it, are directly against it. For if we are not *strictly bound* by a subscription to be Christians and Protestants, we may subscribe with our hands, and declare with our lips, and yet in our hearts be very *Papists, Jews, Mahometans*, or what we please.

I must therefore ask, for what purpose any man subscribes to, what the author calls, an *established form*, that is, to the *book of common prayer*, and all the doctrines therein contained, but to satisfy the church that he *believes them*? otherways his subscription must be attended with an high degree

<sup>i</sup> P. 9.

<sup>k</sup> P. 17.



degree of contumacy against God and man.

For it hath often been insisted upon, and that with the utmost truth and propriety, that our articles are articles of doctrine, and that kind of *assent* which is given to *christian doctrines*, we call *faith*; and, therefore, when a person declares his *assent* to these doctrines, we must of necessity understand that he *believes* them: if he does not, *quo teneam nodo?* how are we to deal with him, or what are we to think of him?

If such fraudulent prevarications as these are admitted of, how can the state be secure of any man's fidelity, or the king of his allegiance; when the same subtilties which can explain away his ecclesiastical subscription, will prevent the most solemn state oaths from binding him? This is such a direct violation of moral honesty, as well as christian fidelity, that it must give offence to every one that wishes well either to the church or state; for should such loose principles prevail, the most important contracts, nay (I repeat it again) the most solemn oaths, on whatsoever occasion submitted to, may like threads be twitched asunder by those

who

who are resolved to have the liberty of turning with every blast.

He may laugh, if he pleases, at some who take occasion, from the form of declaration of assent, to brand those who presume to doubt, or differ from them in any of their IMAGINARY ORTHODOX notions, with the imputation of perjury, or at least of hypocrisy<sup>1</sup>; for whosoever sets up these principles must be guilty of one or both; and though the author were master of as much ridicule as a late *Irish Dean*, any plain man, who will abide by his honesty, might upon this subject, at least, be an overmatch for him.

But he has found out a remedy which he esteems sufficient, if not to remove these difficulties, yet to make him pretty easy<sup>m</sup> under them; if not to heal the wound, yet to stupify the part in such a manner, as to render it insensible of pain: for though by the express words of the declaration, every clergyman is obliged to declare his *unfeigned assent, and consent to all and every thing contained and prescribed in, and by the book of common prayer*; yet since it is said in the

<sup>1</sup> P. 17.

<sup>m</sup> P. 12.

*act of uniformity*, that he shall declare his assent, and consent *to the use of* all things contained in the said book, he may read the declaration with a *latent reference*<sup>a</sup>, to the intention of the act, and thereby assent to nothing more than *the use of* the things, which, in the essay-writer's opinion, is *very different from assenting to the things themselves*<sup>o</sup>.

All of which may be obviated by inverting his assertion, and supposing, that the intention of the act is to be gathered immediately from the words of the declaration, not the intent of the declaration, from the words of the act; and in this we shall have the reason of the thing on our side: for the act of uniformity was unquestionably made to introduce this declaration, wherein we assent *to the things themselves*; and to suppose that it is so unhappily worded as to defeat its own purpose, is to cast a very strange reflection upon those that made it.

Besides, it is enjoined by the act, that the declaration be made *in those words and no other*; which does so absolutely exclude all reference to any other words not therein expressed,

<sup>a</sup> P. 16.<sup>o</sup> P. 12.

expressed, that he may as well attempt to qualify them with an act passed in the reign of *Henry the Eighth*, as with this, passed in the reign of *Charles the Second*.

But even granting (which I have no right or reason to do) either that these words were transplanted from the act into the declaration; or that in the declaration he might be indulged with a *latent reference* to them, this would not set the matter right. For in the book of Common Prayer, to the use of which he gives his assent, are there not *creeds* and *articles*, as well as offices, prayers, and suffrages? And how a *creed*, or an article of doctrine, can possibly be used otherways than by being believed, I own, I am wholly unable to devise. And this will shew, that the *uniformity of profession*, he would contend for, cannot possibly subsist, without an *uniformity of faith*: for as the *profession*, which is to be *uniform*, must be a *profession of faith*, still the difficulty will remain, unless indeed, by the dextrous chop of a logical weapon, it is possible to split the words *profession of faith*, and shew that a man's *profession* is one thing, and his *faith* another.

In



In short—Our Articles are articles of doctrine; and therefore every declaration of *unfeigned assent and consent* to them, strictly implies a *belief* of them: and when the author takes upon him to insinuate that *a man, for prudential reasons, may honestly subscribe and submit to the use of one established form, though he, in his private opinion, may think another to be better*, it is in other words, a man may solemnly declare that he believes, what he does not believe, and yet be an honest man; nay, that he believes such things, as no man can be either honest or christian without believing; whether he declares it publicly or not.

Before I drop this subject, I must humbly take the leave of remonstrating to the author, that he knows all these shifts and evasions to be insufficient—For if a clergyman may *profess* what he does not *believe*; or if a subscription for peace-sake to an establish'd form be all that is required, what is it that makes him so restless; and whence proceeds his vast desire of correcting that form? Is it to set his brethren right in articles of faith? No: that he esteems useless and impracticable; and yet, in flat contradiction

to this principle, it is the purpose of his whole book to contend for it. But error is seldom so happy as to be consistent with itself; and from these contradictory principles, when laid together, it appears, that articles of faith, when drawn up according to his fancy, *are* necessary; but when obtruded upon the world, according to the analogy of scripture, and the judgment of others, they are *not*.

As the affair of a *fraudulent subscription* hath been largely and fully treated by Dr. *Waterland*, and that in a much better manner than it can ever be done by me, I refer the reader to his *Case of Arian Subscription*, and the *Supplement* to it, which have, and always may give general satisfaction upon this point; and if the author had read them, he might have found a much greater difficulty in making himself, as he hath done, so *easy* under these circumstances.

Having thus endeavoured to misrepresent the *subscription* of the Protestant clergy, in order to effect for himself some imaginary deliverance from the obligation of it, he proceeds to set that of the *Nicene* bishops in the same light; that their subscription,  
when

when falsely charged with the same frauds, and degraded to a like insignificancy, may keep his own in countenance. He tells us, that at the council of *Nice*, the Emperor Constantine *allowed every one to put their own sense upon the word consubstantial, and not the sense that was intended by the compilers of the creed: and accordingly, Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, though he at first refused subscribing, yet when he was allowed to interpret the word consubstantial, as meaning ONLY, that the Son was not of the same substance with the creatures that were made by him; he then subscribed it, and so, in a little time after did Arius<sup>P</sup>. I will not say that I suspect all this to be false, because I can prove, that there is not one word of truth in it, from beginning to end; which the author, perhaps being conscious of, has spared us the trouble of being referred to his authorities.*

For in the first place, the Emperor did not allow any of the subscribers to put a sense upon the word *consubstantial*, different from that intended by the compilers of the creed; and it would have been very strange,

D 2

if



if he had instructed the Bishops how to understand a creed of their own compiling, being then but a *catechumen*, and neither then nor ever after so assuming as here represented. The word (*Homoöusios*) *con-*  
*Eusebius* *substantial*, was added to the creed by general consent, and is explained, not as meaning ONLY, *that the Son was not of the same substance with the creatures that were made by him*; but according to the express words of *Eusebius*, which I here give at length, *that the Son of God hath no community with, or resemblance to created beings; but that in every respect he is like to the Father only, who hath begotten him; and that he does exist* of NO OTHER SUBSTANCE OR ESSENCE BUT OF THE FATHER. To this (adds *Eusebius*) thus explained we thought good to give our assent; more especially, because we also knew, that some of the ancient learned and eminent Bishops and writers have made use of this term *Homoöusios*, in their explications of the divinity of the Father and of the Son. Thus much therefore we have said concerning the creed published (at Nice) to which WE ALL AGREED, not inconsiderately and without examination, but according to the SENSES GIVEN, which



which were discussed in the presence of our most pious Emperor, and for the fore-mentioned reasons received with UNANIMOUS CONSENT<sup>9</sup>. Now what appearance is there in all this, either that the subscription of *Eusebius* was fraudulent, or that the Emperor indulged the subscribers with a private sense of their own; when all the Bishops who were present at the *Nicene* council, subscribed the creed according to senses given and agreed upon: five only, out of three hundred and eighteen, being recusants? Not the least appearance in the world! but as the faithful Bp. *Bull* observes, *Quis cordatus fidem habebit mendacissimo isti hominum generi?* Tho' I am really concerned to see a man of learning engaged in this bad cause, yet at the same time I rejoice to find, that the advocates for *Arianism* think and know, that it cannot be kept from falling to the ground, but by a chain of forgeries.

But we have not yet done with them: for the subscription of *Arius* is mentioned in so artful a manner, and shuffled in with that of *Eusebius*, as to make the reader suppose

<sup>9</sup> Socrat. Hist. lib. I. ch. 3.  
P. 144. §. 4.

<sup>1</sup> Def. Fid. Nic.

pose they were both of the same complexion: whereas, in truth, no two circumstances could be more singularly different. The latter assented to the *consubstantiality* of the Son, in terms sufficiently clear and strong; but the former, under the most wicked subterfuge. We are told, that he *wrote* down his own heretical opinion upon a piece of paper, which he concealed in his bosom; then appeared boldly before the Emperor, signed the creed, and took an oath that he did really think—as he had *written*. It will not be impertinent, I hope, to add from the history of *Socrates*, what follows concerning him; in which, though there are some coarse and disagreeable images, yet, as they are inseparable from the relation, the reader will make the best of them. “ But divine vengeance  
 “ closely pursued *Arius’s* audaciousness; for  
 “ when he departed from the imperial palace, a terror proceeding from a consciousness of his impiety seized him, which  
 “ was followed by such an unaccountable  
 “ disorder in his bowels, as occasioned him,  
 “ together with a large quantity of blood,  
 “ to

“to discharge his spleen and liver, so that  
 “he died immediately.”—I hope we shall  
 hear no more of *Arius's* subscription.

We are now returning once more to the  
*act of uniformity*; for it seems (to the essay-  
 writer) that these words, to the use of, were  
 omitted (in the declaration) with design, as  
 a snare to oblige poor conscientious men to  
 give up their livings: and accordingly, he  
 tells us, that there were 1800 persons de-  
 prived of their livings, rather than submit  
 to the terms prescribed\*. This, besides be-  
 ing an invidious slander against the legisla-  
 tive powers, affords us a specimen of that  
 benevolence towards people of all sects, or  
 of none, so much admired by the free and  
 candid ones of the present age, and passed  
 off upon the world for that true spirit of  
 love to our *Christian* brethren, so much in-  
 sisted upon in the Gospel.

While fiery and infatuated bigotry pre-  
 vails in the church of *Rome*, under the  
 name of zeal, I cannot but observe (and  
 truth, when observ'd, can offend no reason-  
 able man) that this *Laodicean* coldness and  
 insensibility prevails amongst us, under that  
 of

of *charity*: both of them so destructive of all true religion, that it is difficult to say which is the most pernicious. If we bring them to the holy scripture, that divine standard, by which all virtues and vices are to be measured, we may form a proportionate judgment of them, by the different rebukes they have both received from the mouth of *Christ*: to the former it is said, *ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of*: to the latter, *I will spue thee out of my mouth*. Bigots mistake and exceed the *Christian spirit*; they are much too tall for the standard-mark: but your *benevolent* ones crouch down, and are afraid of reaching up to it, lest they should be enlisted as *Christian* soldiers into the army of the King of Kings, and carried forth to the battle. Those who indulge this lazy luke-warm principle, may, while they endeavour to avoid it, give as much real offence to the sincere believers, as even the bigotry of *Rome* itself can do to a dissenter, and be unawares carried out into the most dangerous lengths of heretical licentiousness; since its humour is, to palliate every the most abominable deviation from the orthodox faith,



faith, established by *Christ* and his Apostles, and received by the church as the only lasting bond of its indispensable union, with the soft phrase of, *a different mode of thinking!*

One of these modern advocates for separatists and enthusiasts of all denominations, had the following observation made to him by a friend, who with a proper indignation interrupted his harangue, and said, "Sir, "I believe you have *charity* for the devil;" at which he, not at all moved, mildly replied, "Why, *poor spirit*, one may hope "that there is mercy in store for him!" How near the *author's* benevolence approaches to the instance here mentioned, I will not take upon me to determine; but let the reader judge for himself, when he considers, that these *poor conscientious men* were no other than the *Oliverian* schismatics, who in their spirit of Christian meekness, fought God by plundering the state, destroying the church, murdering the King, and defiling the altars of *Christ*.—*Why, poor spirits!*

Mr. *Echard* gives us the following account of them—"If considered altogether, "they were a confus'd mass and body of

E

"several

“ several sects, and men of different prin-  
 “ ciples, many of whom mortally hated  
 “ each other; and if it be remember’d,  
 “ how many of them had been unjust in-  
 “ truders, trumpets, and incendiaries in the  
 “ late miseries of the nation, and unmerci-  
 “ ful persecutors of the legal clergy of *En-*  
 “ *gland*; and likewise, how few were wil-  
 “ ling to disown their seditious practices,  
 “ it is no wonder, &c.” We are told in  
 the same page, “ that there was more  
 “ sound doctrine preach’d throughout the  
 “ kingdom in one twelvemonth after their  
 “ *fatal Bartholomew* (the day on which  
 “ these *poor spirits* were discharg’d) than  
 “ had been in nigh twenty years before.”

I have set down at p. 14. a very extra-  
 ordinary expression of the essay-writer’s *ima-*  
*ginary orthodox notions!* which is such a  
 bare-fac’d indignity, such an affronting slight  
 upon the important doctrines held by the  
 Protestant church of *England*, that I am  
 pretty confident it cannot have passed un-  
 observ’d: and a small degree of penetration  
 will enable the reader to foresee from it,  
 what *his notions*, when extracted, will be  
 concerning

concerning *orthodoxy*, together with its opposites, *heresy* and *schism*.

First then, for his *orthodoxy*; which according to the common sense of the word, is constituted by the established religion of any country: and hence it comes to pass, that a person may be esteemed as very orthodox in England or Ireland, who would be deemed as an heretic at Rome, or in other countries<sup>w</sup>. *Orthodoxy* then, is nothing fix'd and stated, but changes its nature according to the different temper of the climate it resides in, and *Chameleon*-like, can assume any colour it chances to sit upon, and still be as good *orthodoxy* as it was before. This, it seems, is gathered from the common sense of the word: but if what is here taken as the common sense of *orthodoxy*, be an erroneous or abused sense, nothing but error can depend upon it, or be fairly inferred from it. And that it is such, must be evident to every one who is able to construe the Greek (*ορθοδοξία*) or knows that in the primitive ages, it was used only to denote the right opinion, that is, the Christian faith in general, as received in the Catholic church

- E 2

planted

planted by the Apostles, which, in their days, was one and the same all the world over; and none but the faithful members of this one communion were termed *orthodox*. To this purpose *Justin Martyr* observes, ὀρθοδοξοῖσι μόνοι θεῷ ἀρεσκοντες\*, *the orthodox only are pleasing unto God*: and so *Theodoret*, τῇ ὑπερ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν δόγματων ἀγωνιζόμενος, ὀρθόδοξον ὀνομαζόμενος†, *we call him orthodox, who earnestly contends for the apostolic doctrines, that is, the faith once delivered to the saints by the Apostles*. Thus also, when it is said of the three thousand converted *Jews*\*, that they continued steadfastly in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, it is perfectly the same, as if they were declared, in one word, to have been *orthodox*: and therefore, every particular church now subsisting in the world, is *more or less* orthodox, in proportion as it approaches nearer to, or is more remote from, the purity of the apostolic times.

But, on the contrary, if any point of doctrine, whether right or wrong, may, by a strange abuse of the word, be esteemed *orthodox*, because it makes a part of the *established*

\* Qu. i. ad Orth.

† Acts ii. 42.

‡ Pref. ad Dial.



*blished religion of any country*; then the author's definition, if admitted and applied, will prove that any particular church may be *orthodox*, where it is *beterodox*; which is, what we commonly call, a contradiction in terms. And yet, proceeding upon a fallacy, so easily detected, he descants, thro' twenty pages, upon the crime of *heresy*; measuring it all the way, by this his false standard of equivocal orthodoxy, and setting it forth as an insignificant deviation from any established form, which, as it happens, may be sometimes right, and sometimes wrong. I will run over these pages, and extract in short, as well as I can, the sum of that doctrine they contain.

Accordingly, I find, that six of them\* may be reduced to the following propositions—The Christianity of the Apostles, was, by the blind Scribes and Pharisees of the *Jews*, called *heresy*—and therefore, *it is possible that an heretic may be in the right.*†

No; nothing can possibly be inferred from hence, but that a person who is *in the right*, may be falsely called an heretic by those, who are *in the wrong*. Which conclusion

\* From p. 22. to 28.

conclusion can answer no purpose in the world; and farther than this, I apprehend, he cannot go: for it is not in the power of argument to shew, that the word *heretic*, when applied by some to one who is in the *wrong*, and by others, to one who is in the *right*, should signify the very same thing; and unless it is, his conclusion becomes void, and of no effect.

Amidst his discourse upon heresy, he is pleased to produce a text from St. *Paul*, in which, by the assistance of a large comment, the Apostle is tortured till he delivers a very singular account of this crime, together with the reasons for which the church is impowered to inflict a punishment upon those that are guilty of it: an account, so foreign from the purpose of that glorious instrument of the Holy Spirit, that I dare be confident, he would rather have suffered martyrdom, than have submitted to deliver it. The text is this—*A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject: knowing that he that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself*. From which, the author presumes

in

in his comment, that an heretic is such, not for the sake of any destructive opinion he maintains in opposition to the truth, and to the extreme peril of his own soul, but that *he sinneth, by persevering therein after admonition*; and that this *perverseness of his will, not the error of his judgment, is the cause and foundation of his excommunication*.

So that it is the *admonition* an heretic receives from the church, which makes him become guilty of that very crime, for which he is *admonished*; and he commences a complete heretic immediately upon his excommunication, and not before: because, if it is the ecclesiastical censure which renders him guilty, his guilt must increase with the severity of that censure; and when the censure hath arisen to its full growth, the crime likewise must have done the same. But a small-attention to this matter will enable us to perceive, that here we have a false account of *schism*, instead of a true account of *heresy*; and that upon this the author proceeds in what follows.

For it is declared moreover in these words of St. Paul, that an heretic is *self-condemn'd*;

at which passage we are directed by a very judicious marginal reference, to *Acts* xiii. 46. where *Paul* and *Barnabas* tell the *Jews*, upon their rejecting the Christian faith, that they judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life. This therefore was supposed by those pious men, who made the reference, to contain that very sentence of condemnation, which an heretic passes upon himself; and properly enough, as might be shewed at large. But the essay-writer, agreeable to his usual method of taking the perspective by the wrong end, diminishes it down to a petty conviction only, of his wilful *perseverance in opposition to the church*: which exposition does not touch upon the meaning of the text, since in other words it will stand thus—*An heretic is sensible that he is condemned by the church*—whereas, on the contrary, the Apostle has asserted in terms, that he is *condemned by himself*; that is, he is sensible of his guilt, and accused by his own conscience. From the whole of what our author hath said upon this subject, we may collect this unscriptural definition of heresy—It is an offence, not against the revealed will of God, and the concerns of

3

eternity;



eternity; but against the will of man, and the transitory regulations of this life; not against the faith, but against the church that abides by it. Which, in effect, is to suggest, that the church sanctifies the faith; whereas, on the other hand, it is always taken for granted, that the faith sanctifies the church.

And what are the motives which excite him thus to diminish this vice, and improve it if possible, by *speaking smooth things, and prophesying deceits* about it, almost into a christian virtue? Why it seems the words *schismatic* and *heretic*, are sounds, which, ever since the days of Popery, occasion wondrous horror in the ears of the vulgar<sup>d</sup>. And as he is apprehensive, that many of his brethren, upon discovering his attempt to corrupt the doctrines of the church, and disturb the peace of it, will load him with these opprobrious names; he esteems it his interest to explain away their true meaning, and to brand those with the name of superstitious and papistical *vulgar*, who shall apply to him in their proper sense, such nauseous appellations. By this means, whatever noise

F

they

<sup>d</sup> P. 19.

they shall chance to make in *his ears*, he may contemplate his own interpretation of them, and continue to enjoy his repose.

I cannot better obviate these dangerous insinuations, than by setting down a true description of *heresy*, as it stands in the Holy Scriptures; which being dictated by the infallible Spirit of God, and written before the *days of popery*, cannot be charged with inflaming the account of any vice, or of adulterating its own divine truth with any hot and impure spirits, distilled therefrom in after-ages, by the superstitious church of *Rome*. To proceed then—

2 Pet. ii. 1. *There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, or (αἵρεσεις ἀπωλείας) heresies of destruction.* Heresies, therefore, are *damnable*; that is, they lead their advocates and propagators to *destruction*; and in general they are *privily brought in*, (παρεισαγωγῇ) they are carried round about, and introduced at some private entrance; they do not make their approach with that undisguised honesty, which fears no discovery, but steal into the household of faith——under the masque of conscience.

The apostle goes on—even denying the Lord that bought them—yea, these false teachers shall, to compleat their guilt, even dare to deny the Lord that bought them; either by rejecting the ransom he hath condescended to pay for them, or by disowning that he, who paid that ransom, was the LORD.

The remaining part of the verse declares, that they shall bring upon themselves swift destruction, though for a short time they may escape the terror of an earthly tribunal, yet the eye of God can penetrate into the inmost recesses of their hearts, pursuing them through all their dark and intricate windings; and his arm will at length drag them forth from their hiding places, to appear at the bar of his tribunal, whose mercy and long-suffering they have abused and affronted: though they may delude themselves with the vain presumption that they can contradict God, and yet be in the right; that the matter they are upon is *barely speculative*, and such as God careth not for; yet if their crime be such as the apostle here means to describe, their judgment now of a long

*long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not.*

In 1 *Tim.* iv. 1. Heretics, or those who depart from the truth, and sollicit others to follow their pernicious ways, are called *seducing spirits*, or persons actuated by that original seducer, who first tempted man to apostatize from the wisdom of God, and to follow his own lascivious fancy, in contradiction to an express command of his maker: their heresies are termed *doctrines of devils*, invented by the adversary, and set up as rivals to the pure and saving doctrines of *Christ*; and those who set forth and propagate such doctrines, are declared to be *ministers of Satan*<sup>e</sup>, artfully substituting and diligently preaching his word of death, instead of the *word of life*; nay proceeding so far as to call the former by the name of the latter, that they may render it the more palatable, and tempt their hearers to swallow down such poisonous impurities with greediness.

This I take to be the true account of heresy, because the scripture gives it me, and because I find it insisted upon as such by all the

<sup>e</sup> 2 Cor. xi. 15.



the pious writers of the ancient church, now so much despised and neglected: and if it is the true, surely we ought to tremble at seeing this destructive evil with many specious subtilties recommended to the world, under the soft phrases of *an opinion barely speculative, a different mode of thinking*! If an *heretic* means no more than *one of a different opinion from the majority*<sup>f</sup>, whether that majority think right or wrong; if, I say, this reasoning be true, then the scriptures are false; and the essay-writer, I fear, hath too much penetration, not to discern, that this alternative is unavoidable.

As I have alluded to the term, *barely speculative*, it may not be amiss more fully to remark this *writer's* strange misapplication of it: for, is it not astonishing, that by *opinions barely speculative*, he would have us understand the chief and fundamental mysteries of the christian faith; nay, that very root and stock, from whence groweth all moral obligation to us as *Christians*, all strength and comfort in this world, and all our hope of everlasting salvation in the next? All this, as depending upon the *doctrine of*  
*the*

<sup>f</sup> P. 32.

+ *the Trinity*, is, it seems, nothing but a mere lifeless theory, an empty subject for the mind to exercise its curiosity upon, and concerning which, it may think and imagine for itself with as great freedom, as it does about any baseless and airy fabric of modern *metaphysics*. But it is evident that the scriptures give no warrant to this distinction of *speculative* and *practical* duties; for when the *Jews* put the following question to *Christ*—*What shall we do that we might work the works of God?* his answer was—*This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.* Where then is the difference between faith and works?

Since the principles of the christian faith, in common with those of all other religions, are (in the author's opinion) *barely speculative*; he seems to wonder that *men should be more displeased with one another for any difference of opinion about them, than for their being of different sizes or complexions*; and observes, that *for this, no reason in general can indeed be assigned*<sup>2</sup>, as to the squabbles of *Pagans* and the devilish malignity of *Mahometans*, concerning their wicked delusions and

<sup>2</sup> Ded. p. 33.

and abominations, they are entirely out of the question, though he is pleased to suppose they are not, by complaining of this unaccountable *degree of animosity, as practised in all countries, and almost in all ages*<sup>b</sup>.

But as to the differences between men professing themselves *Christians*, some of whom really are what they profess to be, while others are not; though a reason *in general* cannot be assigned for them, we are pretty sure that a reason in particular may, and that a very strong and cogent one, having nothing less for its sanction than the authority of the Holy Spirit. For *whosoever abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, is not to be received by us into our houses, neither are we to bid him God speed*, (that is, we are not in any wise to encourage his attempt, or promote the success of it) *for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds*<sup>i</sup>.

And our blessed Lord himself tells his apostles, that if any one *neglect to hear the church, he should be unto them as an heathen man and a publican*; adding withal (on a very proper occasion) that divine authority upon which the church is to proceed—*Whatsoever ye shall*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>i</sup> 2 John ix. 10, 11.

*shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven*<sup>k</sup>. And though it be now esteemed necessary that we should entertain very moderate and qualified sentiments about such passages as these; yet, we must not forget, that in the scriptures, there are such.

Seeing, therefore, it is absolutely requisite that there should be a proper degree of authority in the church, grounded upon the commands of God; and a distinction or difference preserved between such as are humble and believing, and such as are refractory and unbelieving, lest by encouraging the guilty, the innocent should partake of their crimes; it is somewhat strange that the *Reverend Essay-writer* should spend several pages in the unnatural endeavour of bringing about a coalition between *Christians, Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics*; not considering, that amongst such, it is impossible there should be any community of sentiment, or any hearty reconciliation. For if those who are on the right side are quiet and at rest, those on the wrong, are, through the implacable spirit of him that *from the beginning*

<sup>k</sup> Matt. xviii. 17, 18.



*beginning was a murderer*, so restless and malignant, that they never will, or can be; and for the truth of this, I might appeal to the testimony of all ages.

When there lieth open that plain middle road, of resting upon the *most certain warrants of holy scripture*, and of having such a degree of charity for mankind, as to encourage none of them in sin, this he will not attend to, but flies off on the one side, and descants upon *fire and faggot*, as the sanction of human appointments in the church of *Rome*; and on the other, runs away with an invitation after *Christian Priests, Bramins, and Mustis*, jovially to associate them, as it were, in a *midnight modern conversation*; for an agreement between them, is utterly inconsistent with any sober intentions.—But with all this, there is somewhat of a railing accusation intermixt; for as the *conduct of mankind* (it should be of *Christians*) is quite *otherways* in this respect, that is, as they sometimes disagree, and will have *no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness*, but rather reprove them; he thinks this can be attributed to nothing but a vicious pride in our natures,

*which gives us an aversion for every one that differs in opinion from us.* Was it always an act of *pride* then in the church, when she excommunicated an heretic? And cannot a believer assert the articles of his faith, and endeavour, if not to convince, at least to confute a *gainsayer*, without being called *proud*? God forbid. We will never believe that those salutary precepts, which He hath given us for the regulation and welfare of his church, can, unless they are abused, be unto us an *occasion of falling*.

But let us examine this a little farther; for, if where this conduct is to be found, if where any person expresses a dislike or abhorrence for another, on account of his religious principles, there a *vicious pride* is also to be found; this will charge a vicious pride upon the *Son of God* himself, who while his soul overflowed with tenderness for an unbelieving and abandoned nation, could yet say to them, *ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?* And again, *ye are of your father the devil.* St. Paul in like manner said to the *Jews* who refused to hear him, *your blood be upon your own heads*; taking it  
 3 for

for granted that they were given over to destruction: and, on another occasion, he hath this severe reflection concerning some, who by false doctrines made Christ of none effect: *I would they were even cut off, which trouble you.* That glorious martyr *Policarp* likewise, who lived in the age of the apostles, and was by them ordained bishop of *Smyrna*, happened one day to meet *Marcion* the heretic, who said to him, "what? will you not acknowledge me?" "Yes, answered he, I acknowledge thee for the first-born of *satan*<sup>1</sup>;" which, I presume, would have sounded very harsh in the ears of a candid disquisitor.

This being a reflection, therefore, of which they upon whom he would cast it, are altogether unworthy; I may, without the least injustice, return it back upon the *heretical herd*; for they are the men, who abound with a *vicious pride*. This it is, which gives them their incurable itch of singularity, and inclines them to prefer their own fallacious reasonings and groundless opinions, to the dictates of the *Most High*. As the following are the words of *St. Ignatius*

G 2

upon

<sup>1</sup> *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. 4. Ch. 14.*

upon this subject, I hope I may adopt his sentiments for my own, and set them down without giving offence. “The spirit of  
 “error vaunteth itself, and proclaimeth its  
 “own excellencies; it seeketh to gratify  
 “its own will and pleasure, and humour  
 “its desire of vain glory; it is full of dis-  
 “dain, lying, fraudulent, soothing and  
 “flattering, artful, patching things toge-  
 “ther to make them look plausible, tri-  
 “fling, discordant, never to be silenced,  
 “evasive, timorous<sup>m</sup>.”

In this dedicatory introduction to his es-  
 say, our author hath several *pleas* (*arguments*  
 I will not call them) by which he seeks to  
 countenance his vast desire of reforming the  
 doctrine of the Trinity, as it stands at pre-  
 sent in our creeds and articles: it remains,  
 therefore, that I extract these, and give  
 them their answers separately according to  
 that order in which they occur.

*Plea I.* “If the church be not infallible  
 “any more than the state, why may not  
 “that

24<sup>m</sup> Το πλανον πνευμα εαυλο κηρυττει, τα ιδια λαλει· αυθαρισκευ  
 γαρ εστιν, εαυλο δοξαζει· τυφω γαρ εστι· μισην, ψευδολογον υπαρχει·  
 απαληλας, θραπυλικον, κολακειυλικον, υπωλον, ραψωδον, φλυαρον,  
 ασυμφωνον, αμειροσπι, γλισχρον, ψοφοδις. Cited by Suicer.  
 V. i. p. 127.



" that be amended as well as the state ? And  
 " why should we be more afraid of break-  
 " ing the peace of the church than of the  
 " state ? the peace of the one being full as  
 " necessary to be preserved, as the peace of  
 " the other<sup>n</sup>."

No just parallel can, I think, be drawn between the fallibility, or infallibility of the church, and of the state, since they are not directed by the same rule, and are conversant about matters greatly differing from each other : the one about invariable truths, which concern the everlasting happiness of man, and are determined by divine revelation ; the other about national or political principles of its own devising, which as far as they are built upon human authority or national compact, may be varied at pleasure, as the different exigencies of times and occasions shall require ; as far as they partake, in common with the ecclesiastical rule, of divine authority, these are as unalterable as that. If, therefore, it can be clearly proved that any *human errors* have crept into the church, any positions *contradicting* the word of truth, let them, in God's name,

name, be reformed : but as to the essential articles or substance of the christian faith, it must for ever remain fixed and unmoveable, as that scripture upon which it depends. As concerning the latter half of the above quotation, it must be confessed, that the peace of the state is necessary to be preserved, and that *for conscience sake* no Christian will dispute it ; but I apprehend that the author, by his manner of expression, means to represent the peace of both as absolutely of equal concernment to the welfare of mankind ; which is to put things spiritual upon a level with things natural, the things which are seen with those which are not seen, things temporal with things eternal—and falls very little short of downright atheism.

*Plea II.* “ I am under less apprehension  
 “ for the church than for the state ; for as  
 “ to the christian religion in general, we  
 “ have the sure word of prophecy, that  
 “ the gates of hell shall not prevail against  
 “ it ; and as to particular establishments, I  
 “ should apprehend, that the freer they  
 “ were from errors, the more likely they  
 “ would

" would be to stand." Tis true, a candlestick with a light burning in it may be removed from one part of the house to another, without extinguishing the light; but, yet, the apartment from which it is removed, having no light but what it received from it, will be left in the dark. The light of christianity will always burn *somewhere* till the end of the world; but no particular church or nation can from this prophecy receive any well grounded encouragement to tamper with the faith, through a vain presumption of its entire continuance, although the members of that church, under the specious pretence of snuffing the candle, are continually endeavouring to put it out. Suppose the christian religion, when expelled from *Great-Britain*, should settle whole and sound in the city of *Amsterdam*, it would give us but cold comfort to reflect, that though the christian religion *in particular* had left us, yet the christian religion *in general* was still subsisting somewhere in the world.

Before any *particular establishment* is freed from its errors, we must ask, who is to judge

judge of those errors? A council of learned and pious men, assembling in the fear of God, or one solitary objector, who is pleased to think that such reformers complied so far with *the humour of the times*<sup>p</sup> in which they lived, as not to have effected a *thorough reformation*? If we admit the *author's* judgment, we shall have that very doctrine (with many more) expunged as an error, for the renouncing of which the *eastern* churches were totally extirpated, I mean the divinity of the Son of God: for it is universally allowed that *Arianism* was the crime, which chiefly prevailed amongst them, and wrought their destruction.

*Plea III.* "It is manifest, that before the  
" reformation took place, the same argu-  
" ments were then made use of, against any  
" innovations in religion that are now; and  
" all alterations were as much declaimed  
" against."

Hence this *writer* means to insinuate, that as a reformation in religion was once made, against an unreasonable opposition, and the church freed from its errors; a reformation (however opposed) ought to be made



made again: that is, there always may be a reformation of a reformation; and because the church, at the time here mentioned, had many errors, and was cleared of them; therefore she must have many more, and may be cleared of them again. Which is an excellent medium for proving that *Mary Magdalen* had fourteen devils; and that because seven were cast out, seven more must have staid behind.

*Plea IV.* "If a storm should arise (the church) may run a risque of having that tree torn up by the roots, which might have been saved by a little pruning<sup>r</sup>."

Whence is this storm to arise? not from any *Popish* power; because then the most adviseable method would be, not to lop and to *prune*, but to engraft fresh branches upon the old stock. It is therefore to arise from the opposite point of the compass, the stripping party; and by the *author's* foretelling this storm, he seems to have as formidable an idea of the Dissenters, as if they were able to fly away with us in a whirlwind.

How comes he to confess, that the very persons, in whose behalf he so strongly

H

pleads

pleads for a reformation, are a sort of men, which will *tear the tree up by the roots* for us? The *tree*, I take for granted, is the *Christian faith* at present growing in the church of *England*; and we are advised to *prune* it, in order to oblige those, who (tho' a while ago they were set forth as *poor* and *conscientious*) will, rather than fail, *tear it up by the roots*. However, he seems to know his men, and gives us a pretty just character of them, by putting a little storm and tempest into their composition. But what can he mean by a *little pruning*? for it is the design of his essay to set aside the doctrine of the *Trinity in Unity*; and to recommend an alteration of this nature, under the name of a *little pruning*, will be understood by every judicious reader as a most dangerous mistake: for this doctrine, as hath been already observed, is the *root* of the *Christian religion*; and to *prune* a tree, by cutting up the root of it, is the way to make the branches, not shoot out and flourish, but wither and decay: and if this be our method of *pruning*, we may bid defiance to the fury of our adversaries; for when his

*tempestuous*

*tempestuous* gentlemen come to rip and rend, there will be nothing left for them to do.

*Plea V.* "The most proper method that  
" could be taken to render the church of  
" *Ireland* truly *catholic*, would be——to  
" open the gates of its communion as wide  
" as was consistent with the Gospel of  
" Christ."

How wide the *author* thinks that to be, cannot exactly be determined, till he speaks more explicitly: but we ought to be very cautious how we enter upon this *widening* scheme, for fear of making a fatal mistake——for *strait is the gate which leadeth unto life*; as on the contrary, *wide is the gate which leadeth to destruction, and many there be, which go in thereat*\*. It may be said, without giving offence to any sincere believer of the churches of *England* and *Ireland*, that if they were opened as *wide* as some affectedly-moderate and disguised spirits among the Dissenters would have them, they might pretty much resemble those described by the poet,

———*The gates wide open stood,  
That with extended wings a banner'd host*

H 2

Under

\* Ded. p. 62.

\* Matth. vii. 13, 14.

*Under spread ensigns marching, might pass  
through*

*With horse and chariots rank'd in loose  
array* \*.

What kind of army that is, which would march through the gates of our communion, were they thus opened, may justly be conceived by taking a review of that confused rout, which, a little above a century ago, when they were torn off their hinges, marched into our churches, tore the sacerdotal vestments, converted the pulpits and communion tables into butchers blocks and shambles, and then cavalcaded in triumph through our streets with surplices over their coats, and tooting upon the broken pipes of organs, which they had chopt down with their pole-axes. At a time when one of these mad processions was making, after the demolition of a church, one of their commanding officers staid behind, with a few choice friends, to christen his horse in his own urine, which he had plentifully discharged into the baptismal-font; and called him *Ball Esau*, because *he was hairy* \*.

And

\* Par. lost. B. II. l. 884.

¶ Many shocking accounts of this sort are to be found in *Foulis's History of the Pretended Saints*, B. II. whence this is taken.



And can we think that men of this disposition would ever live in peace and agreement, even supposing that the church of *England* was swept and garnished in the manner they desire, with *seven wicked spirits* ready to receive them? No: dissention is their profession; and if the church were swallowed up and lost in their schism, they must then dissent from Dissenters, rather than not dissent at all: and this they certainly would do; for it is said of those *poor conscientious men* which were discharged for nonconformity, that even when they were uppermost, and had usurped a tyrannical dominion over the church, they *mortally hated each other*. *Presbyterians, Quakers, Anabaptists*, and all the spawn of dissention, even at this day preach with such implacable animosity against dissenting brethren of different denominations from themselves, that it plainly appears they only want power to persecute them. The *Antitrinitarians* of *England* were anathematized by those of *Poland*\*; and this is the compliment which most heretics and separatists are ready to pay each other. In one point indeed they all agree,

\* *Leslie*. Theolog. works, fol. v. I. p. 220.

agree, that *Christ* is to be opposed, and his body, the church, torn in pieces; but they are ready to cut one another's throats about the manner how; which to those who look on, is but a very bad recommendation of their cause. Therefore, in God's name, let us keep where we are, and leave them to themselves; let these ungodly men *fall into their own nets together*, but let us ever *escape them*.

Plea VI. ' The preface to our *Book of Common Prayer* declares, that "*the particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions, such changes and alterations may be made therein, as to those that are in place and authority should, from time to time, seem either necessary or expedient.*"

This passage is taken by the essay-writer in as large and unlimited a sense, as if those pious men, who reviewed our excellent Liturgy, had thereby insinuated a permission

to change the essential articles of faith therein contained, according to the various humours of every age; or to alter the *doctrine of the Trinity*, &c. in such a manner, as that the Liturgy might always wear a garb suitable to the cut of the times. If they intended that a more restrained sense should be put upon their concession, it will do him little or no service; for it cannot in any shape answer his purpose, or countenance his proposed method of reformation, unless it be made to appear, that by such *forms of divine worship, rites, and ceremonies*, as are *in their own nature indifferent and alterable*, they mean *Creeds, Articles*, and all other *essentials* of the *Liturgy*; since these are the points wherein he would contend for an alteration. But this is such an indulgence, as those faithful and judicious men well knew they had neither a right to grant, nor a liberty to accept of; and if they are permitted to speak for themselves, they will soon be cleared of the accusation here brought against them. For nothing can more expressly set aside such a Latitudinarian acceptance of their words, or more justly characterize all our reforming adventurers, than  
the

the lines which immediately follow the above passage, extracted from their Preface to the *Book of Common Prayer*. Their observation is this, “ accordingly we find, that “ in the reigns of several Princes of blessed memory since the reformation, the “ church, upon just and weighty considerations, (her thereunto moving,) hath yielded to make such alterations in *some particulars*, as in their respective times were “ thought convenient: yet *so*, as that the “ *main body* and *essentials* of it (as well in “ the *chiefest materials*, as in the frame and “ order thereof) have still continued the “ same unto this day; and do yet stand “ firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all “ the vain attempts, and impetuous assaults “ made against it, by such men as are *given to change*, and have always discovered a “ greater regard to their own *private fancies* “ and interests, than to that duty they owe “ to the public.” They likewise inform us, that after the restoration, “ divers pamphlets were published against the *Book of Common Prayer*, by those who under the “ usurped powers had made it their business to render the people disaffected there-



“ unto; the old objections were mustered  
 “ up, with the addition of some new ones,  
 “ to make the number swell.” And that  
 at the time of their review, “ of the sundry  
 “ alterations proposed to them, they re-  
 “ jected all such as were either of dangerous  
 “ consequence (as *secretly striking at some*  
 “ *established doctrine*, or laudable practice  
 “ of the church of England, or indeed of  
 “ the whole Catholic church of *Christ*) or  
 “ else, of no consequence at all, but utterly  
 “ frivolous and vain.”

It might have been as prudent therefore  
 in the author, not to have meddled with  
 this Preface; since it is directed throughout  
 against all such changeable minds, as “ seek  
 “ occasion of cavil, or quarrel against the  
 “ Liturgy of the church.” But it is his  
 method to extract a scrap, and either by  
 quoting it wrong, or interpreting it falsely,  
 to make a writer speak what sense he pleases;  
 which is a mighty disingenuous practice,  
 but frequently to be met with in his book,  
 as the reader must already have observed,  
 and will many times more, before I have  
 done with it.

And now, after having seen the very peculiar cast of his reasonings against the articles of faith established (by the blessing of God) in the church of *England*, we cannot be at a loss to know what he means by that *freedom of thinking*, which he supposes to have been promoted by the legislature, *not only since the reformation, but even since the revolution*<sup>y</sup>: and likewise what sort of principles they are, from whence arises that air of triumph, with which he observes, that the *eyes of mankind have* (of late) *been greatly opened*<sup>z</sup>. If their eyes are opened so wide as to make them, instead of truth, see nothing but the intricate error of their own imaginations, and, instead of submitting to divine revelation, to know what God is, better than he himself does; happy would it be for them, if they were still blind. But I have such an opinion of my brethren and countrymen, as to think, that, many of them at least, whatever they *may* be in time to come, are not yet persuaded, that *all* knowledge, and wisdom, and judgment, is within the compass of their own free and unrestrained reason: and, that such

a suggestion as this, may now, and always, be a *slander* against the greater half of them, is all the harm I wish them.

WE are now entering upon the work itself, the *Essay on Spirit*; which, I presume, is so called by the author, because, in the beginning of this piece, he lays down a short system of metaphysical speculations, concerning the nature and essence of God, the Spirit of the world, or *anima mundi*, the operations and essence of the soul of man, together with the existence and power of angels or created spirits. But before he hath advanced many steps into this system, he flies off into objections against the divinity of *Christ* and the *Holy Spirit*; works up his own metaphysical principles, with what is revealed in the Old and New Testament concerning them, and then cements the whole together with those impure traditions of the *Rabbies*, which originally made the word of God of *none effect*, and were insisted upon by the *Jews*, after their dispersion, on purpose to deface and obscure the doctrines of the primitive Christian church.

It is not my intention to confront his system with another of the like nature, or to launch out into any metaphysical disquisitions upon these points; since to argue in this speculative manner, and to proceed merely upon conjecture, is to *fight as one that beateth the air*; and instead of shewing his errors, nothing could hereby be manifested but my own weakness, enough of which may perhaps appear, without my diving into the cold obscure of *metaphysics*. I shall therefore meddle with this system, no farther than as it clashes with revealed truths, and shall remark, as I go along, his abuse of Heathen learning, and misapplication of the holy scriptures; in doing which, we shall find that his speculations, altho' they appear in a modern garb, are very ancient, since they may plainly be traced up to their origin, *Gentile philosophy*.

If, in the course of these remarks, I should sometimes be obscure and immethodical, I hope it will be chiefly owing to the author's less perspicuous manner of treating his subject: for when I peruse his book, I confess myself often puzzled to perceive the connection; and his arguments are frequently



quantly so dispersed, that it is no easy matter to collect them. However, that I may the more readily be understood, I shall divide my reply into several chapters: the *first* of which shall comprehend his notions concerning the nature and essence of God, the Spirit of the universe, and the human soul—the *second*, those relating to the existence and power of created spirits—the *third*, his objections against the divinity of the *Son*—the *fourth*, his objections against that of the *Holy Spirit*—the *fifth*, the extent and validity of his conclusion—the *sixth*, his enquiry into the sentiments of the primitive Fathers—the *seventh*, his misapplication of the Heathen *Trinities*—the *eighth* and last, his remarks upon the *Athanasian* and *Nicene* Creeds.

## C H A P.

## C H A P. I.

*In which his notions concerning the nature and essence of God, the Spirit or Instinct of the universe, and the soul of man, are considered.*

**I**T must give us some surprize, to see the first scene of this *essay* open with an atheist giving his definition of God; that is, of what he was pleased to assume for the supreme Governor of the universe. For the author tells us, "The opinion of *Spinoza* was, that there is no other *substance* in nature but God: that modes cannot subsist, or be conceived, without a substance: that there is nothing in nature, but modes and substances: and that therefore every thing must be conceived as subsisting in God<sup>a</sup>." By which, if I am so happy as to understand him, he means—that as there is nothing in nature but *modes*, or various manifestations of impressed action; and as these *modes* cannot subsist without a *substance*, therefore all the motion or action which appears in nature, must proceed from

the

<sup>a</sup> *Essay*, p. 1.—Spin. Op. Posth. Eth. par. I. p. 12.

*Spinoza*

the intimate presence of God's substance expanded through the universe. Which opinion of *Spinoza*, hath always been allowed to terminate in *atheism*; because if pursued, it proves that the universal substance of nature, animated by a concomitant intelligence, is God: which substance being nothing more than inanimate matter, and the modes therein observable owing to material or *second* causes, under the direction and influence of the *supreme*, leaves us without any God at all, except that which all idolaters have allowed, *the creature rather than the Creator*.

How far the author's opinion co-incides with this of *Spinoza*, will appear as we proceed. For according to him, "It may be asserted that there is in nature but one self-existent being, substance, or substance, which, by way of eminence, may therefore be called the *substance*, or, figuratively and comparatively speaking, the *only being, subsistence, or substance in nature*." As to the first part of this sentence, we grant that there is but one self-existent being; but it cannot follow from

hence,



hence, that there is but one *substance* or *sub-*  
*stance*; because a *substance* (except when it  
 is improperly used for the word *essence*)  
 always implies something *material*; whereas  
 a *being* may be either *material* or *imma-*  
*terial*. However, to make this somewhat  
 plausible, he "would be understood to  
 mean by these three words (*being*, *sub-*  
*sistence*, and *substance*) one and the same  
 thing;" that when the words are grant-  
 ed to be synonymous, whatever is proved  
 of a *being*, may hold good of a *substance*;  
 which is not arguing, but equivocating. I  
 take notice of this, because, in the next  
 page, the scripture is introduced giving its  
 verdict in favour of this opinion. "When  
 Moses (says he) enquired of God, by  
 what name he should make him known  
 to the children of Israel, God said, thus  
 shalt thou say—I AM, hath sent me unto  
 you—which is rendered by the Sept. *אני*  
*אמר, I am he that is, or that exists;*  
*as if, comparatively speaking, there was*  
*no other being or existence but God."*  
 In this comment, the essay-writer hath  
 dropt the words *subistence* and *substance*,  
 and

P. 2.

P. 3.

X I am the Being  
 Ask Mr. B. The Hebrew.



and introduced only those of *being* and *existence*: but as he would be understood to mean the same thing by all of them, we have his own authority for substituting one for the other as we think proper; and then his paraphrase upon  $\epsilon\gamma\omega \epsilon\iota\mu\iota \circ \omega$  will be,  
 " I am he that *subsists*; as if there were no  
 " other *substance* but God." He adds, that  
 " from this passage it probably was, that  
 " Plato borrowed his notion of the name  
 " of God, when he asserted that the word  
 "  $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ , *est*, is solely applicable to the nature  
 " of God. And from him it probably was,  
 " that the word  $\epsilon\iota$ , *thou art*, was written on  
 " the door of the *Delphic* temple<sup>e</sup>." But  
 the original text can, I apprehend, afford  
 no room either for this comment, or for  
 introducing these Heathen parallels. It is  
 אהיה אשר אהיה, where the *Hebrew* root of  
 the verb אהיה *I am*, is הוה  $\text{HOVAH}$  *to be*;  
 from whence is plainly derived the word  
 יהוה *Jehovah*, which when given under a  
 paraphrase, doth not comparatively denote  
 the *only being* or *substance*, but strictly and  
 properly, Him *which was, and is, and is to*  
*come*; and expresses the *self-existence* or *es-*

K

sential

Created Beings  
not self-existent. [ 66 ]

sential eternity of the divine nature, as distinguished from *created* Beings, which have a beginning *a parte antè*, and a dependent duration *a parte post*.

Dependent on what? As for the speculations of *Plato*, &c. concerning their false God, it is impossible to make them square rightly with the inspired appellations of the true; and such authorities being extremely vague and uncertain, will at any rate do the *author's* cause no service; for it is by no means clear that *Plato* asserts that the word  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$  is solely applicable to the divine nature; since he also asserts, that it is applicable to the essence of the human soul<sup>f</sup>. And moreover, while *Plato* tells us

Plato perhaps is right

To exist, & to stand out, i.e. of or from God.

that  $\tau\omicron\ \omega\upsilon$  (or as he hath it in the neuter gender  $\tau\omicron\ \omega\upsilon$ ) is the only Being that *exists*; his scholar *Aristotle* holds that it is the only Being which is abstracted from existence, or which does *not exist*. Those who are fond of such contradictions, may enjoy them whole and entire if they please; but when they are introduced to the depravation of any sacred truth, we must then be obliged (whether it be civil or not) to drive them off with a *procul este profana!*

Not so fast! Mr. Author.

The

<sup>f</sup> Πῶς αὐτῆς (ψυχῆς) ἐστὶν ἡ οὐσία, ἔχουσα τὴν ἀπαισιότητα τῆς τοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν. Phaed. § 41.

The author next considers God as the *first cause*, and argues thus—"The consciousness of my own existence necessarily leads to a *first cause*, which first cause can only be *one*, because two first causes are a contradiction in terms." And this argument is ushered in with the following caution, "I hope I cannot be thought so absurd or so impious, as to imagine that there are more Gods than *one*." By which he seems to accuse the orthodox with *absurdity* and *impiety*; and to suppose, that because they maintain a plurality of *Persons* in the *unity* of the essence, they imagine that there are more *Gods* than *one*; that is, more *Jehovahs* or *self-existent* Beings. But what if this very absurdity and impiety is to be found in that author, who here seems so expressly to declare against it? And this I think, is the true state of the case; for it is his opinion, that the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Spirit*, are three Beings, absolutely distinct from each other; but at the same time he owns very freely (as we shall see hereafter) that the name *Jehovah* is applied to all of them: and, therefore, according

K 2

P. 5.

to

to the allowed interpretation of that word, which conveys the same sense with *Exod.*

*This is not the translation.*  
 iii. 14. I AM THAT I AM, he must hold three *separate self-existent Beings*, which is as flat a contradiction as *three first causes*. To allow that the only name of God which implies *self-existence*, is applied to the *second* and *third* persons of the *Trinity*; and then to argue that they are not *coeternal* with the *first*; if it was not wicked, would in a learned man be an unpardonable blunder.

*I am*  
 Now we are upon the subject of *self-existence*, it will be proper to note that *Christ* (on more occasions than one) assumes this undisputed characteristic of essential divinity. *Before Abraham was* (says he) I AM; describing his own existence by the *permanent present*, expressive of that mode of existence, which can only be conceived of the *supreme God* or *first cause*. The comment of *Lucas Brugenfis* upon this expression is—*Non dicit eram, sed SUM, ut notet constantem ipsius, et immobilem æternitatem*<sup>b</sup>.

But

<sup>b</sup> See *Pole* in loc.



But as concerning the *first cause*, the author affirms, that "every thing which exists besides that, which way soever it is brought into being, whether it be *begotten, ten, emanated, created, or 'spoken forth*, it must proceed from, and owe its existence to the WILL as well as power of that first cause." And to make this appear plausible, he adds, in a note, the opinion of *Athanasius*, who (as he tells us) "acknowledges it to be impious to say that God the Father was necessitated to act, even when he begat the Son; and allows also that neither the Son nor the Holy Spirit are the first cause; but the Father alone, and that the Son and Holy Spirit were both caused<sup>1</sup>." How studiously doth he in all this avoid the word *creature*! though he takes care to express the same thing in other words, as the *Arians* always did: for which reason, *Athanasius* in that very page<sup>k</sup>, to part of which the author refers us, thus appeals to his readers—

"How manifest is their crafty ambiguity!  
 "for while they are ashamed to call him  
 "(*Christ*) the *work of God*, or a *creature*,  
 "devise

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*<sup>2</sup> Vol. 1. p. 512.

don  
not  
begin

Certain  
ly

X  
X  
is  
the end of  
Gard

“ devise other modes of speech, introducing the term WILL, and saying, that unless he existed by the *will* of God, God was necessitated to have a Son *against his will*. But (adds he) ye impious men, which pervert every thing for the sake of your *heresy*, who pretends to ascribe necessity to God?” And this is his method of acknowledging it to be impious to say, that *God the Father was necessitated to act*; which expression, as it stands together with the context, appears in a light extremely different from what it does in the author’s reference to it.

’Tis true, *Athanasius* does speak of the Father as a cause, but not in the author’s sense of a *first cause*. “He begets the Son (saith he) and sends forth the Spirit, and, therefore, we call the Father a *cause*<sup>1</sup>;

*There is the effect*

meaning only that the first person of the Trinity is a cause, with respect to that office he hath taken upon himself in the œconomy of man’s redemption; in which sense, he is not a natural, but an œconomical cause. However, as there is no undoubted warrant

<sup>1</sup> Γενᾷ μὲν τὸν Υἱὸν ἐκπορεύει δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καὶ διὰ τούτου λέγεται ὁ Πατήρ αἰτία. V. 2. p. 443.

rant of holy scripture for the terms *causa* and *causatus*; I think, indeed, *Athanasius* might as well have spared them, for they tend to no edification, and must, if they fall into bad hands, terminate in presumption.

From page 8 to p. 12. of the *essay*, we have an account of a spiritual power annexed to inanimate matter. I will extract, from this part of his theory, such passages as will enable us to form a judgment of it.—

“ When we see a stone descend to the  
 “ ground—the cause of that motion must  
 “ be some *spirit* or other—since as *nothing*  
 “ *can act where it is not*, that power  
 “ whereby any body continues in motion,  
 “ is as much the effect of some *concomitant*  
 “ *spirit*, as the power which first put it in  
 “ motion<sup>m</sup>.—“ The tendency of one body  
 “ towards another, is from the attractive  
 “ force of some spirit, which attractive  
 “ power, being in proportion to the quan-  
 “ tity of matter, makes the difference of  
 “ weight or gravity in bodies<sup>n</sup>.—“ Every  
 “ particle of active or attractive matter must  
 “ be directed in its motions by some *spirit*,

“ *united*

<sup>m</sup> P. 9.

<sup>n</sup> P. 10.

Matter  
have  
intellect

" united to that matter, which may have  
 " just such a quantity of *intellect* commu-  
 " nicated to it by its creator, as will enable  
 " it to perform those functions which are  
 " assigned it, in order to carry on the gene-  
 " ral œconomy of the universe °?" This is  
 very old philosophy; for the same *spirit* or  
*Spirits* which are here assigned by the author  
 as the causes of motion, were in great repute  
 with the most ancient heathens; but with  
 this difference, they supposed this *spirit* to  
 be a *material* or *corporeal* one, endued with  
 intelligence; whereas his is nothing but  
 mere unembodied intellect, inhering not in  
 any material agent, which is the cause of  
 motion, but in the moved body itself.

This intelligent spirit, by which we are  
 to understand the *æther*, or mixture of air  
 and light expanded through the whole solar  
 system, is the *Athene*, called by *Athenagoras*  
*νοεωνος δια παντων δινοουσα*, a mind or intel-  
 lect pervading all things: which same *Athe-*  
*ne* or *Minerva*, was no other than the active  
 power of the *sun's rays*, or of the *æther* dif-  
 fused every way from his orb, as *Macrobius*  
 delivers it from *Porphry*, who affirmed

that



that *Minerva* was the power of the sun, which (besides its wonderful effects upon inanimate bodies) even communicates prudence and intelligence to the human mind<sup>p</sup>. The same thing we learn from *Jamblichus*, concerning the *Egyptian* deity, *Neith* or *Neithas*, namely, that it was θεου ονομα διηκοντ<sup>Q</sup>. δι ολη τη κοσμου, the name of a God which pervades all nature. And *Tatian* accuses the Greeks with idolatry, for worshipping—πνευμα δια της υλης διηκον, a SPIRIT which pervades matter<sup>q</sup>. But as there is such superabundant evidence to prove that the most ancient heathens assigned the direction of all effects to an etherial spirit, endued with intelligence; I must not drop the subject, without producing a little more of it. The author of the book *de Diæta* (supposed to be *Hippocrates*, though some think it more ancient) describes this subtle agent under the character of etherial fire—"Which silently  
 " and imperceptibly governs and disposes  
 " all nature. In this is life, sense, pru-  
 " dence, the power of increase, motion,  
 " diminution, alteration, sleep, vigilance;  
 " and

L

<sup>p</sup> *Saturn*, Lib. 1. Ch. 17. <sup>q</sup> *Orat. cont. Græcos*, P 144. Edit, Par.

*Etherial  
Fire*

*Proper  
ties of  
Etherial  
Fire*

Cicero—  
nature  
two parts.

Virgil—  
igneus  
Vigor.

“ and it doth with an incessant activity di-  
“ rect all things both in the earth and in  
“ the airy regions<sup>t</sup>. ” The ancient philoso-  
phers, according to *Cicero*, “ divided nature  
“ into two parts, one of which was active  
“ the other passive. ” These they subdivided  
into the four elements; of which, *air* and  
*fire* have the power of *moving* and of actu-  
ating, while the others, *earth* and *water*,  
are passive and disposed to receive their im-  
pressions<sup>t</sup>. With all this, the *igneus vigor*<sup>t</sup>,  
or *spiritus intus alens*<sup>u</sup> of *Virgil*, and the in-  
tellectual *spirit* of our author (though, in-  
deed, he does not seem to understand it)  
perfectly agree.

Perhaps  
not.

Very  
honest.

And here, if by the way, I may be per-  
mitted to give my opinion, I cannot but  
think that the heathen sages, bating their  
atheistical compliment of intelligence, talk  
very rationally of this powerful agent the  
æther; which, if considered as an inferior  
or second cause, under the direction of the  
supreme, and pursued in this sense, might,

second cause.

perhaps,

<sup>t</sup> Πυρ, ὅπερ πάντων επικρατεῖται, διέπον πάντα κατὰ φύσιν,  
ἀποφον καὶ οὐρα καὶ ψαυσι· ἐν τοῦτω ψυχῇ, νοῦ, φρονήσει,  
αὐξήσει, κινήσει, μείωσει, διαλλάξει, ὑπνός, ἐγρηγόρει· τοῦτο  
πάντα διὰ παντὸς κυβερνᾷ, καὶ ταδε καὶ ἐκείνα, ὡς ἐκείνη ἀρεταί.

Lib. 1. Sect. 11.

<sup>u</sup> Acad. Quaest. Lib. 1. Ch. 6.

<sup>t</sup> Aeneid. 6. 730.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid. 1. 726.

Cause can not be under the direction  
of any thing. Only one Cause & one  
Effect through nature.

perh  
natu  
lucid  
New  
and f  
by hi  
lis) w  
genio  
worth  
We  
traced  
whole  
“ It  
“ tha  
“ or  
“ the  
“ ing  
“ for  
“ inst  
“ thei  
“ prov  
This r  
verted,  
air and  
animat  
(what  
“ Qpt.

*An impor-  
tant scene,  
indeed!*

perhaps, open no unentertaining scene of natural philosophy; or at least serve to dilucidate and explain the hints which Sir Isaac Newton<sup>w</sup> hath dropt concerning the power and sufficiency of a material cause (described by him as a subtile *medium*, or *aether subtilis*) which hints, as it is observed by his ingenious commentator Dr. Pemberton<sup>x</sup>, are *worthy of himself*.

*This is  
worth  
reference*

We find this *spirit*, and its operations, traced in brief by the author through the whole creation, under the name of *instinct*.

*Instinct*

"It is by *instinct* (says this philosopher) that the minutest particles of matter attract or repel each other: it is by *instinct* that the flower of the field is directed in throwing forth its leaves and its flowers, and forming its fruit in due season: it is by *instinct* that the birds of the air build their nests; and the beasts of the field provide for themselves and their young."

This reasoning, when the order of it is inverted, will stand thus—The birds of the air and the beasts of the field (which are *animated* beings) provide for themselves by (what we call) *instinct*; and, therefore,

L 2

the

<sup>w</sup> Qpt. Qu. 21. <sup>x</sup> Pemb. View. Intr. p. 22. <sup>y</sup> P. 23.



*Flowers* the flowers of the field (which are *inani-*  
*not* *mate*) grow by *instinct*; and, consequently,  
*inani-* all *inanimate* matter, *attracts*, and *repels* by  
*mate* *instinct*.

But the operations and effects of this *instinct*, may serve as a key, which will help us to discover what that *agent* really is, that is here disguised under a term never before applied to it. He observes, that it is the same *instinct*, which enables the beasts, &c. to provide for themselves, and the flower to throw forth its leaves, and form its fruit: therefore this *instinct* is what the heathens called the *soul of the world*, and I find it commented upon nearly in the same words—*Hæc igitur est ANIMÆ MUNDI natura et dignitas—quæ cælo ignes accendit, æra ac mare luce æstuque replet atque attollit, terras ANIMALIBUS PLANTISQUE, fœcundat, tellurem denique alternâ in ævum vice nunc pruinis, nunc FLORIBUS, VESTIT*<sup>2</sup>. Or if we have a mind to take it from *Macrobius*, it will be still more express—*FLORUM species hic DEUS (SOL sc.) infeminat, progengerat, fovet, nutrit, maturatque*<sup>2</sup>. In like manner according to the true and proper sense

<sup>2</sup> Vallin. in Boëth. Lib. 3. p. 144.

<sup>2</sup> Sat. L. 1 c. 17.



sense of this affair, we read, in the holy scripture, of the *precious things put forth by the Moon<sup>b</sup>*, and of the *tender grass*, which springeth up from the earth, *by clear shining after rain<sup>c</sup>*. So that the *author's* account of *instinct*, brings us back again to the *Athene* of *Jamblicus*, and the *virtus solis* of *Porphyry*.

He, moreover, proceeds so far as to think that "*all created spirits* may owe the limits of their existence, and the extent of their faculties to *matter*: and that the same spirit, which when cloathed with one set of material organs, is only capable of exerting its intelligence in the performing of attraction and repulsion, and when jarring elements meet, &c. breaks forth in thunder, lightning, and earthquakes (*caelo IGNES accendit*) may when united to a different set, of a more delicate contexture, be enabled to *think* and *reason*, and when agitated with anger, to break forth in quarrels, contention, and war<sup>d</sup>." Hence it will follow, that the soul of a *passionate man*, and the soul of *gunpowder*, are in nature the same; only the one is

*cloathed*

<sup>b</sup> Deut. xxxiii. 14. - <sup>c</sup> 2 Sam. xxiii. 4. <sup>d</sup> P. 24, 25.

*Very*  
*slow*  
cloathed with charcoal and sulphur, the other with flesh and blood; and the same soul that operates in a blast of air, which drives impetuously forward, and throws down every thing which opposes its course, may afterwards operate in the body of a tyrant, and tear up kingdoms by the roots.

*This*  
*will*  
*not*  
*be*  
*done*  
But there is another very shocking consequence which will naturally flow from this principle; for if the same spirit which performs only the offices of attraction and repulsion in inanimate bodies, may, when united to a different set of organs, be capable of thought and reasoning; then, *vice versâ*, the same spirit, which when united to the body of a man, is capable of *thought* and *reason*, may when that set of organs is dissolved, be united to an inanimate body, and be capable of *exerting its intelligence*, only in the performance of *attraction* and *repulsion*; which at once destroys the immortality of the soul, introducing us at the same time to the doctrine of *transmigration* in its lowest sense, and to all the jargon of the *Egyptians* about the *revolution of the forms*. But God forbid that any man, who professes himself a *Christian*, should be *spoiled* himself,

Stay — the vic-  
tory is not  
won.

himself, and endeavour to *spoil* others, with such detestable *philosophy* and *vain deceit* as this!

How irreligious and unphilosophical is it to talk of *intellect*<sup>e</sup> in *thunder* and *lightning*! when all these natural operations are performed by the mechanical agency of the air or *æther*, under the direction of God; for so we find them represented in holy writ—*קול שחקים נתנו* ÆHERES *dederunt vocum*, as *Pagninus* renders it, or, as the *English* version hath it—*The AIR thundered, and THINE arrows* (the shafts of lightning directed by the hand of the Almighty) *went abroad*<sup>f</sup>. There is, in this place, no mention of any *spiritual* agency, but that of the *Supreme Being*; nor of any secondary effici- *are there any pri-*  
*mary*  
*efficiently*  
*air, not*  
*a cause*  
*the*  
ents, but the air and combustible exhalations; the former of which is not an intel-  
ligent but a mechanical cause; the latter are materials for it to work upon.

So likewise as to the affair of vegetation; a plant we perceive will not grow without  
the

\* *Cornelius Agrippa* in his *occult Philosophy* mentions nine orders of *Devils*; the sixth of which was called the *powers of the air*, these are very busy in *thunder* and *lightning*, and their prince is called *Mirizim*. See *Le Grand's Body of Phil.* p. 89. fol.  
† *Psal.* lxxvii. 17.

Air only one step in the ladder:  
remove the first step—God, & the air  
will soon cease to be either cause or effect



*Spirit in a plant. How absurd*  
 the agency of *air* and *light* (that is, *heat* the necessary effect of fire or light) whereas, if this operation was performed by the active power of any *spirit* residing in the plant, then it should continue to extract its nutriment from the earth in which it is set, and to flourish without the external agency of any mechanical instrument, which is utterly contradicted by experience.

*Loadstone*  
 But, to be no longer serious upon such a very odd subject, I shall (for the humour of the thing) allow that there are *spirits* or *intelligencies* residing in all bodies, wherein we discern any active or attractive power; and that we may hear how this philosophy will sound, I shall attempt to account for, in the author's stile, the wonderful effects of the *loadstone*. In the *loadstone* then, there are two poles, one of which *attracts*, the other *repels*; and since a spirit which hath the operation of attraction assigned to it, *always attracts as a necessary agent*<sup>e</sup> and that which hath the operation of *repulsion* assigned to it, *always repels*<sup>h</sup>, there must in a loadstone be *two spirits*, sitting back to back upon the two poles, one performing its

<sup>e</sup> P. 11.<sup>h</sup> *Ibid.*



its office of attraction, and pulling the needle towards it, the other that of repulsion, and driving it off. When the poles are inverted, or the attracting one changed (as it may be) into the repelling and *vice versa*; the two spirits have agreed to change places; and when by *fire* or the stroke of an hammer, either a loadstone or magnetic piece of iron loses its attracting and repelling power, the spirits are both of them either burnt out, and expire in a *blue vapour* (as a philosopher once said, who observed this *phænomenon*) or knocked on the head.

He hath likewise philosophised much on the operations, and on the essence of the human soul; but in his reasonings upon the former, he seems greatly to have mistaken the meaning, not only of *Plato*, but also of *St. Paul*. For, having observed, that the human mind is forced to be at the trouble of “ comparing the propositions, which result from the agreement or disagreement of our ideas, in order to arrive at truth : “ hence it is, says he, that *Plato*<sup>1</sup> speaking of human abilities in the investigation of truth, calls it *beholding things in the glass*

M

“ of

<sup>1</sup> In *Phæd.*

“ of reason; which he explains by saying,  
 “ that as those who contemplate an eclipse  
 “ of the sun, *lose the sight of it*, unless they  
 “ are so careful as to view its reflection in  
 “ water; so the eye of an human spirit is  
 “ too weak to find out truth, unless it looks  
 “ at it thro’ the medium of reason; which  
 “ St. Paul also calls<sup>k</sup>, *seeing through a glass*  
 “ *darkly*<sup>l</sup>.”

Plato does not here discourse about *com-  
 paring propositions*, that is, about (λογισμὸς) *reasoning*; but (λογοί) the *reasons* of terrestrial  
 things, or things which *are not*; and in-  
 forms us, that by attending properly to them,  
 we may thence infer the *reasons* of the (τὰ  
 ὄντα) *things which really ARE*, as for exam-  
 ple, by observing nature, it appears that no  
 quality can possibly admit its contrary. *Fire*,  
 the essence of which is *heat*, cannot become  
*cold*, and yet continue to be *fire*; therefore,  
 the soul, the essence of which is *life*, can-  
 not possibly admit its contrary, *death*.

As to the similitude which *Socrates* makes  
 use of, to illustrate this his plan of enquiry,  
 the author hath not rightly understood it.  
 For, says he, “ they who contemplate an  
 “ eclipse

<sup>k</sup> 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

<sup>l</sup> *Essay*, p. 20, 21.

Logos

Essence  
 of fire  
 Essence  
 of soul

“ eclipse of the sun, *lose sight of it*, unless  
 “ they are so careful as to view its reflexion  
 “ in water ;” whereas *Plato* has it thus —  
 “ unless they view the image of the sun in  
 “ water, or some such thing, they *lose* (not  
 “ the *sight of the sun*) but their *own eye-*  
 “ *sight*,” by gazing attentively upon an ob-  
 ject brighter than it can bear<sup>m</sup>. That is,  
 the mind, by contemplating too closely the  
 τα οντα, and endeavouring by its own in-  
 ternal energy to behold them as they are in  
 themselves, will be dazzled and stupifi-  
 ed ; but by having recourse to sensible ob-  
 jects, it may there contemplate the images  
 of them, without being in the least im-  
 paired.

Let us next examine whether *St. Paul*,  
 when he speaks of *seeing through a glass*  
*darkly*, hath any view to the *comparing of*  
*propositions*. The Greek is, βλεπομεν γαρ  
 αρτι δι' εσπित्र εν αινιγματι, τοτε δε προσωπον  
 προσωπον. Now (in this life) we see  
 through a glass (or mirror) by an ænigma ;  
 but then face to face. Wherein he certainly  
 alludes to the manner in which we are  
 obliged to attain to all our knowledge of

M 2

things

<sup>m</sup> Διαφθιζονται γαρ τον νοον τα ομματα, εαν μη εν υδατι  
 η εν τινι τοιωτω σκοπωνται την εικονα αυτου. Phæd. §. 48.

things spiritual or invisible, that is, by using the creation as a mirror in which to behold them: *for*, as he observes in another place, *the invisible things of God are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood by the things which are made.* The whole *natural* world, throughout the sacred oracles, is referred to as a figure of the *spiritual*; instances of which it would be endless to produce: but as my meaning may not be sufficiently clear and explicit without a few, it may readily be remembered, that the *power and glory* of *Christ* is set forth in the operations of the visible *light* or *sun*<sup>a</sup>—his *efficacy* in *raising the dead*, by the *dew* which causes the *grass* to spring forth from the earth<sup>b</sup>—the difference between a corruptible and incorruptible body, by earthly substances and the lights of the firmament<sup>c</sup>—the efficacy of the *Holy Spirit* in cleansing and purifying the *soul*, by *water* which cleanseth the *body*<sup>d</sup>—the hidden manna or invisible *bread of life*, by natural bread, which supports the body, &c. &c. Here are *visibles* substituted

<sup>a</sup> Mal. iv. 2. John viii. 12.<sup>b</sup> If. xxvi. 19.<sup>c</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 38. & seq.<sup>d</sup> John vii. 38, 39. 1 Cor. vi. 11. Tit. iii. 5.

Cause  
may be  
seen  
through  
effects

cause  
effect  
&c.



stituted all the way instead of *invisibles*; because as all our ideas enter by the senses, it is impossible for us to form any notion of the latter, but by viewing them through the medium of the former.

To represent things spiritual under the figures of things corporeal, is (according to the scripture-usage of the word) to speak by an *ænigma*; and to attend properly to this method of conveying knowledge, is to *understand a proverb and the interpretation of it, the words of the wise and their (αἰνιγματὰ) riddles or divine allegories*; wherein one thing obvious to sense is expressed, and another, beyond the reach of sense, intended and understood.

The whole meaning therefore of St. Paul's expression, as I humbly conceive, is this— all spiritual truths are situated as it were above or *behind* us, out of our sight; while the *glass* of the creation lies *before* us, and therein we see them by a faint reflexion: but in another life, when the soul shall be perfected, and the body glorified, we shall then see them no longer by reflexion, but *face to face*; that is, we shall then receive,

view  
causes  
through  
their ef-  
fects.

Speak  
by enig-  
ma—i.e.  
mology.

A weak  
effort  
at phil-  
osophy.

not the reflected but the *direct* rays, which issue forth from them.

But we are now going to consider some operations of the soul, infinitely more gross than those of *thinking* and *reasoning*: for, in the author's opinion, "it is the same" "wise agent which operates in the *digestion*" "of our food, and that enables us to put in" "execution the directions of our will". It is not my province to explain the whole process of *digestion*, &c. nor would the compass of this work admit of the attempt: but, I think, the *Chymists* are pretty generally agreed, that all digestion is performed by the agency of *fire* or *heat*; and Dr. Keil, in his excellent little compendium of *anatomy*, accounts for this operation by the force of steam; which amounts to the very same thing: his words are these—"This" "force (that is, of the fluids acting in the" "stomach) is much augmented by the *impetus* which the *heat* of the stomach" "gives to the particles of the *fluids*; nor" "does this *heat* promote *digestion* only thus," "but likewise by rarefying the *air* contained in the pores of our food, which" "bursts

Very  
true  
perhaps

What  
absurdity

"  
ar  
th  
m  
H  
au  
sta  
til  
nic  
"  
"  
"  
"  
"  
"  
"  
"  
"  
"  
"  
"  
th  
wh  
ria  
im  
th  
"  
cha  
fam  
lib.

“bursts its parts asunder.” *Air and fire* are *material* and mechanical agents: whether they are wise ones or not, I leave my learned readers to judge for themselves. However, thus much may be said for the author, that in this opinion he doth not stand single, since most of the ancient *Gentile* philosophers are on his side. Their opinions are collected by *Manasseh Ben Israel*—*Hipparchus* thought that the soul was “composed of *fire*; *Anaximenes*, *Anaxagoras*, *Diogenes Cynicus*, and *Critias* maintained, that it was *air*. Others again “contended, that it was a mixture of *air* and *fire*, as *Epicurus*. Others affirmed, “that it was a *thin spirit* diffused through “the whole body, as *Hippocrates Cous.* “*Heraclitus Ponticus* said that the soul is “*light*.” With some, or with all of these, the author must concur in sentiment, when he refers the operations of the material or *animal spirit* to the essence of the immortal and immaterial, which is altogether distinct from it.

The

\* *Anat. abridg'd*, p. 41.

“ *De Resur. Mort.* lib. I. chap. 8.—the same collection, with several additions to the same purpose, is to be met with in *Macrobius in Somn. Scip.* lib. I. chap. 14.

No! No!  
the  
Wisdom  
lies be  
hind the  
curtain.  
= Soul  
by  
Gentiles  
= Spirit  
diffused  
through  
whole  
body.  
No! No!

The *Chevalier Ramsay* is pleased to say, that the *Pythagoreans* "always distinguished" between the *understanding* or the *pure spirit*, and the *animal soul* or *etherial body*: that they considered the one as the source of our *thoughts*, the other as the cause of our *motions*." But I could wish, that this learned man had been a little more exprefs in his evidence for the truth of this distinction. It is, to be sure, highly rational to suppose that there is an *animal soul* or *etherial fluid* diffused through the body; and this agent bids the fairest for supplying us with an easy and natural solution of *muscular motion*\*: but after what manner the *will* or *intellectual spirit* makes its impressions upon this, so as to cause it to exert its influence, must always remain a secret.

When the *essay-writer* imputes these mechanical operations of the *material spirit*, to,

\* *Theol. of the ancients*, p. 40, 41.

\* Sir *Isaac Newton* was plainly of this opinion, and has a remarkable passage to our purpose—*Adjicere jam liceret nonnulla de spiritu quodam subtilissimo, cujus vi & actionibus—sensatio omnis excitatur, & membra animalium ad voluntatem moventur, vibrationibus scilicet hujus spiritus ad cerebrum & a cerebro in musculos propagatis. Princip. Schol. gen. ad fin.*

*Spirit  
Source of  
Thoughts  
Animal  
Soul cause  
of action*

*No—not  
remain  
a secret*

*Newton  
on  
Spirit  
in  
Man*



to, what he calls, a *wise agent*, he seeks to confirm his *hypothesis* by this common observation, that "when the belly is full, the bones would be at rest; which (says he) seems entirely owing to this, that the spirit, being unmolested with human cogitations, and its attendance upon our will, may be more *at leisure* to pursue those operations, which are immediately necessary towards our preservation." So then, there are upon this occasion no dull fumes which arise from the stomach, and oppress the *sensory*: no; the *spirit* is so much taken up with its natural functions of *digestion, concoction, separation, &c.* that it is too busy to think or reason. He might have added, as a collateral proof, that when a man takes physic, and the soul is exercising its *purgative faculty*, he is then less able to study, read, or meditate: which may be easily accounted for upon his principles; though physicians indeed are so impertinent as to say, that such an indisposition is entirely owing to a relaxation of the whole frame, which forbids any intense application of the bodily organs.

N

As

y Ibid.

Very  
con-  
bible  
remark

In pro-  
portion  
as the  
animal  
is inert  
the  
spirit  
will be  
incapa-  
ble; be-  
cause it  
can only  
appear  
through  
the mate-  
ter of the  
body.

As I have now finished my first chapter, I think it necessary to observe, that this head of the *essay* we have hitherto been upon, is entitled by the author, *The doctrine of the Trinity considered in the light of nature and reason*, because, unless the reader were reminded of it, he might not so readily perceive any connection between that sacred doctrine, and these philosophical speculations.

---

## CH A P. II.

*The existence and power of created spirits.*

“ I. **T**HERE seems to be no contradiction (says the author) in supposing that God might communicate so much power to one of his own *creatures*, of a more exalted nature than man, as to enable him to *create* inferior beings, and frame a world of his own<sup>2</sup>.” This is introduced, I presume, in order to prepare us for conceiving, that *Christ* may be a *Creator*, and yet notwithstanding this, be himself

<sup>2</sup> P. 271.

himself a *creature*; which, in effect, was the heresy of *Carpocrates*, who affirmed that angels were the creators of the world<sup>a</sup>. But by a *Creator*, the *Christian* world hath always understood a *first cause*: and if there are more *Creators* than one, there are more *first causes* than one. So that the *author* hath hereby entangled himself in a contradiction, which, a while ago, he seemed to hold in the very utmost contempt. And farther, if God may give this power to one creature, because *there is no contradiction in it* (which, by the way, is such a turn of arguing as will run us upon everlasting suppositions) then he may, for the same reason, communicate this power to any or to all of those spirits he hath given being to. So that we are like to have a strange confused multitude of *Creators*, which it must be blasphemy to mention, or even to think of: but I am obliged to take that dirty road the *author* leads me; and if I am not so successful as to turn him out of it, I may possibly prevent others from striking into it.

II. He goes on—"We cannot say, but  
" that some spirits may be furnished with  
N 2 " bodies

<sup>a</sup> Ο δὲ Καρποκράτης Ἀγνῶς τὴν κόσμον δημιουργὸν εἶναι φησὶ.  
*Aibanaf. Orat. II. contr. Arian.*

“ bodies of so delicate a texture, that they  
 “ may cloathe themselves with light, as it  
 “ were with a garment, may make the clouds  
 “ their chariot, and walk upon the wings of  
 “ the wind<sup>b</sup>.” We have no right to infer  
 any such thing from a description, meant  
 only of the supreme God: for to Him it is,  
 that *the Psalmist* in the preceding verse ad-  
 dresses himself—*Bless the Lord* (אֲתָ יְהוָה)  
*O my soul*: O LORD my GOD, thou art be-  
 come exceeding glorious, &c. As the supreme  
 God is most indisputably here denominated  
 by the word *Jehovah*, it argues a great de-  
 gree of presumption in the author to rob  
 him of the context, and apply it to *created*  
*spirits*, without being able, or even at-  
 tempting, to produce any reason or autho-  
 rity for so doing.

III. And again—“ That no worlds, fil-  
 “ led with intelligent spirits, were created  
 “ till about 6000 years ago; about which  
 “ time, both *reason* and *revelation* agree,  
 “ that this ball of earth began to *revolve*  
 “ about the sun, is a thought unworthy of  
 “ a philosopher<sup>c</sup>.” *Reason*, to be sure,  
 hath many proofs that the world was creat-

ed

<sup>b</sup> P. 28.<sup>c</sup> P. 30.

Soul



ed just about 6000 years ago; the first and most striking of which is, that it cannot prove it to have been created at all. For *Aristotle* maintained that it was *eternal*<sup>d</sup>; and even though he had received some obscure account of the world's creation by tradition, absolutely rejected it as absurd and incredible: and *Aristotle* is, I think, allowed to have been a perfect master of *reason*. But how doth revelation agree, that this ball of earth began to *revolve* about the sun? If the author can shew where the scripture asserts the revolution of the earth, he hath an opportunity of settling a controversy, which hath long distressed the learned world with regard to the sacred philosophy.

IV. After he has supposed, that a *creature* may be a *Creator*, purely because it is *no contradiction*; he passes on to that rule or dominion over the earth, and the several nations of it, with which he imagines the angels to be invested. In relation to which, he first suits himself with an opinion from the heathens, and then attempts to make the scripture perfectly conformable to it. The *Pagan* notion of this matter, as delivered

<sup>d</sup> Gale's Court of the Gent. P. II. B. 6. ch. 1.

6000  
years  
ago.  
Eternal  
says  
Aristotle.

vered by the *Essay-writer*, is as follows:—

“ *Hesiod*, one of the first *heathen* authors  
 “ extant, supposeth myriads of invisible spi-  
 “ rits cloathed in air, attending upon this  
 “ terrestrial globe, and employed as *angels*,  
 “ that is, *messengers*, between the great God  
 “ and mankind, observing their actions, and  
 “ reporting them to *Jupiter*.” And *Plato*  
 says\*, “ that *Saturn* well knowing there was  
 “ no man who could have absolute empire  
 “ over others, without abandoning himself  
 “ to all kinds of violence and injustice, sub-  
 “ jected the nations to *dæmons* or *intelligent*  
 “ *spirits*, as their lords and governors<sup>f</sup>.”

As this gentleman does, for the most part, give a lame and imperfect account of every thing, it will be proper to examine more particularly into the nature of these *dæmons*: this done, it will be very clear, that there neither is, nor can be, any resemblance or similitude between them, and the *ministring spirits* of the true God, mention'd in holy scripture.

*Hesiod* tells us, that “ the race of men  
 “ which lived in peace and security in the  
 “ golden age under the reign of *Saturn*,  
 “ were,

\* *Plato de Leg. lib. 4.*

<sup>f</sup> *P. 32.*

“ were, when they died (upon the expira-  
 “ tion of that happy age) ordained by the  
 “ wise counsel of *Jupiter* to be dæmons,  
 “ which go to and fro about the earth  
 “ clothed in air, observing the good and  
 “ evil actions of men.” The *dæmons*  
 therefore, or *myriads of invisible spirits* which  
*Hesiod* supposeth, are nothing more than the  
departed souls of men, cloathed in air: as for  
 their being *angels* or *messengers* between the  
 great god (that is, the *heathen Jupiter*)  
 and mankind, he says nothing about it.

*These  
poor  
souls  
are much  
indebted  
to the  
author*

But there happens to be a very notable  
 contradiction, as to this affair, between  
*Plato* and *Hesiod*: the one supposeth these  
*dæmons* to have been appointed by *Saturn*,  
 that is, during the time of the *golden age*;  
 because his administration and the *golden*  
*age* expired together: the other maintains,  
 that they were ordained by *Jupiter*, who,  
 as it is well known, did not begin his reign,  
 till he had first castrated and dethroned his  
 father *Saturn*.

Another account of these beings, given  
 more at large, is to be found in *Apuleius*,  
 which I shall contract into as small a com-  
 pass,

§ *Hesiod. Epy. lib. I. l. 108, &c.*

pass, as can conveniently be done, and set it down. " There are certain middle powers  
 " (between the *gods* and *men*, that is) which  
 " are divine: these the *Greeks* call *dæmons*,  
 " by whom, as *Plato* supposes, all the mi-  
 " racles of magicians are performed, and  
 " the various signs, such as appear in the  
 " entrails of beasts, the flashings of lightening,  
 " &c. by which we foretel future  
 " events, are regulated; for it is not worth  
 " the while of the *Dii superi* to condescend  
 " to such offices as these. They have bodies  
 " so exactly balanced, that they are neither  
 " too light nor too heavy; for were they  
 " too light, they might mount upwards,  
 " and fly off into the more remote ethereal  
 " spaces; were they too heavy, they might  
 " then take the lower road, and be precipitated  
 " into the infernal regions." The  
 argument, made use of by *Apuleius*, to  
 prove the existence of these airy *dæmons*,  
 is something curious: " For as there are  
 " animals which inhabit the *earth*, others  
 " which live in *water*, and others again, as  
 " *Aristotle* contends, in *fire*; therefore, argues  
 he, it is absurd to suppose that the  
 " element of *air* is left desolate, and with-  
 " out

Middle  
powers  
between  
God &  
Men.

Air  
inhabited  
says Apuleius



“ out its proper inhabitants generated in it:  
 “ as for birds, they are more properly to  
 “ be esteemed terrestrial animals <sup>b</sup>.”

Such is the nature of dæmons, as described by the Heathens, who believed in, and worshipped this tribe, only because they thought the matter of the universe to be eternal, and the *air* (of which according to them the human soul was a part) divine and intelligent. Whether there is any resemblance between these and the *ministring spirits* mentioned in the *holy scripture*, will appear when we consider, that the former depend upon the matter of this system for their existence, and hover continually in the air; the latter were in being before it, and dwell in the presence of <sup>1</sup> God. We should likewise remember the promise of *Christ*, that at the *resurrection* we shall be as the *angels of God which are in heaven*; and if by *heaven* is meant the *material heaven*, or expanse filled with spirits, then our residence is to be as theirs is, in the *air*, which is every way impossible. For at the last day, *the heavens*, or expanse, (esteemed *divine* and *intelligent* by its infatuated votaries)

O

<sup>b</sup> *Apul. de Deo Socratis*, p. 62, &c.

<sup>1</sup> *Rev. xii. 7. Dan. vii. 10.*

Matter  
 eternal  
 air di-  
 vine &  
 intelligen-  
 & soul  
 a part  
 spirits  
 two kind  
 Christ  
 says we  
 shall  
 be as  
 angels

*The  
world  
shall  
cease.*

taries) shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burnt up<sup>k</sup>.

V. But we ought to enquire, how the *Heathens* can possibly be qualified to give any evidence worth our notice upon this point? The opinion of the *Essay-writer* is, that "the *Greeks*, it is certain, and *Plato* "in particular, borrowed many of their "theological sentiments from the *Hebrews*; "among whom this, of a number of in- "visible spirits attending upon this globe "of earth, and presiding over states and "kingdoms, was certainly one<sup>l</sup>." The infinite disparity between the two accounts of these spirits, as given, on the one hand, by the heathen philosophers, and, on the other, by the scripture, should, I think, seem entirely to preclude any such supposition. But what *Hebrews* does the author here mean? not the modern *Jews*, for they borrowed from the *Greeks*, and corrupted their own theology, by heathen philosophy. If he means the *ancient Hebrews*, they must have been so very ancient, that none of their

sentiments

<sup>k</sup> 2 *Pet.* iii. 10.

<sup>l</sup> P. 33.

sentiments are to be found but in the early parts of the scripture - history. For the *Greeks* received most of their knowledge, and indeed all their ancient theology, from the *Phœnicians*; being descended from those *Canaanites* which in the time of *Joshua* inhabited *Asia*, who afterwards were called *Phœnicians*, and spread themselves from *Asia* into *Africa*, and from thence into *Greece*, *Italy*, &c.

Hence came that knowledge which the *Greeks* had of writing or *letters*, from *Cadmus*, as they say, but rather from קדמ, CaDoM, the *East*<sup>m</sup>, the land of *Canaan*, from whence the *Israelites* had driven them. And this indeed they clearly confess, by calling this *Cadmus* a *Phœnician*, and their letters Φοινικία, the *Phœnician things*<sup>n</sup>, as being absolutely of *Phœnician* or oriental origin.

All their theological sentiments of this early date, were certainly derived from the *Canaanites*; and the very highest of them must founder in that idolatry, by adhering to which, the inhabitants of the land of *Canaan*, had filled up the measure of their

O 2

ini-

<sup>m</sup> See *Miscel. reflexions* upon Mr. *Squire's* essays.

<sup>n</sup> *Chishul's* antiq. Asiat. p. 99. N<sup>o</sup> 37, 38.

iniquities, and were destroyed or exterminated by the armies of the living God.

As for any sentiments of *Phœnician* theology, borrowed and picked up by *Plato* in his travels, he himself is not very clear concerning them. He calls them *Phœnician* and *Syrian fables*, and declares that they were *απορητοι*, *unspeakable*, that is, (as the learned *Gale* very judiciously comments) *because he neither understood, nor could express the mind thereof*°. Now these must have been either portions of the pure scripture, or *Jewish* comments upon the scripture—if they were the former, the original of them must be found in the *Bible*; if they were the latter, it is most likely they were impure forgeries; because ever from the *Babylonish* captivity, to the coming of *Christ*, they grew daily more and more ignorant, in proportion as oral tradition prevailed, and the plain word of scripture was thereby corrupted. In either case *Plato* confesses that he did not understand them, and therefore not much can be gather'd from them. As to the affair of *dæmons* or *intelligent spirits*, in particular, *Plato* expresses himself so clearly



ly upon this, and withal so differently from the scripture, that we may fairly conclude, that this sentiment was *certainly not borrowed* from thence.

However, upon the whole I will confess (and it must be confessed) that some articles in the theology of the Pagans, were originally of *Hebrew*, that is, of *divine* extraction: but then they are so desperately mangled, so altered to the purposes of heathenism, and turned into the channel of idolatry; that to think of truly explaining any mysterious doctrine of the scriptures by these ethnic perversions of it, would be no less absurd, than to search for the true sense of *Virgil*, in Mr. *Cotton's Travestie*.

VI. We now pass on to the scripture itself; from whence the author hath extracted several passages, in proof of this his doctrine, of a "number of invisible spirits attending upon this globe of earth, and presiding over states and kingdoms:" whether these proofs have any relation to the point in hand, will appear upon an examination of them.

1. The first is, the text of *Deut. xxxii. 8.* as rendered by the LXX—*When the Most*

*Higb*

*See the original*  
*erroneous translation*  
 High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels of God<sup>p</sup>. The words which the LXX have most unaccountably translated by αγγελοι θεου, angels of God, are, in the Hebrew original, בני ישראל, children of Israel, with which our author is so fair as to acknowledge, that the rendering of the LXX does not *exactly* agree. I need not therefore descend to any critical examination of this matter, till he can shew us, either that בני ישראל is equivalent to αγγελοι θεου, or that the authority of the LXX is superior to that of the Hebrew text.

*not an angel*  
 2. The second is the following passage from the wisdom of Sirach — For in the division of the nations of the whole earth, God set a ruler (or governing angel, says the author) over every people; but Israel is the Lord's portion<sup>q</sup>. In the first place, this is an apocryphal book of scripture, which the church doth not apply to establish any doctrine<sup>r</sup>; and in the second place, the original word, which he renders by, governing angel, is nothing more than ηγεμενος, a leader

<sup>p</sup> P. 33, 34, 35.

<sup>r</sup> See Article VI.

<sup>q</sup> Essay, p. 34. — Ecclesiast. xvii. 17.

leader or head of a nation"; and yet, two pages after this, he boldly refers to this metaphor, as if it were a true and undisputed construction.

3. "What adds no small weight with him in this affair, is an expression made use of by St. Paul, *Heb. ii. 5.* where, speaking of the second coming of our Saviour, in a state manifestly superior to angels, he says, *for unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, of which we speak.* Whence it seems to appear, that it was St. Paul's opinion, that this present world had been put in subjection to angels." No such thing can appear, because, in the last verse of the preceding chapter, St. Paul asserts the very contrary, and informs us, that the angels are all ministering spirits, sent out to minister for

\* *ἡγεμὼν* is used *Gen. xxxvi.* near 50 times by the LXX in this sense. And in this very book of *Ecclesiasticus*, the word *ἡγεμὼν* signifies a master or ruler—not an angelic one, because certain moral directions are given him for his behaviour. *Ch. xxxii. 1.* or, as some copies have it, *ch. xxxv.* the title of, which is—*περὶ ἡγεμῶν.*

\* How comes the author to confess that the state of Christ is manifestly superior to angels? for we know of no intellectual beings, but God, angels, and men; and as angels are superior to men, and Christ superior to both, he must, according to this concession, be God.

" P. 36.

3 classes  
God,  
Angels  
Men

for them, who shall be heirs of salvation. If therefore all of them, which have any intercourse with the earth, are appointed only to minister or serve, they are not appointed to rule or have dominion: unless it can be proved, by some unintelligible subtilties, that a person by being minister'd unto, is put into subjection; which, I must apprehend to be impossible.

4. " This opinion is confirmed by St. Jude — for says he, Ἀγγέλους τε τῆς μὴ τηροῦσάντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἰδίον οἰκητήριον, &c. The angels which kept not their principalities with due care, but neglected their proper provinces, he (God) hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness." This is the author's translation, and he asserts, that the " verse ought to be so translated". His earnest desire of obscuring the doctrine of the blessed Trinity, leads him into perpetual mistakes; for, a more erroneous translation than this, was surely never offered by any man of learning in the world. 1. He is pleased to render ἀρχὴν, principalities, and οἰκητήριον, provinces, in the plural, when the



the original words are both singular; which makes a great difference. 2. The word αρχη cannot relate to any principality which the fallen angels once had over the earth, and forfeited by a neglect of their duty; because after their fall, they still preserve their title of αρχαι—for, saith St. Paul, *we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, αρχας*<sup>x</sup>. 3. The words ιδιον οικητηριον, cannot signify, *their proper province*, that is, a nation over which an angel had the government, because οικητηριον never signifies any thing but an *habitation* or *dwelling-place*; and to render it as the author does, is as unscholar-like a piece of criticism, as if he had asserted, that when Strabo calls Athens the σοφων οικητηριον, he means that it was the place, in which *wise men were governing angels*. 4. The dwelling of those angels which St. Jude speaks of, could not have been any nations or provinces upon earth, because the angels which fell, fell from *heaven*—*How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning*<sup>y</sup>! 5. When they were cast down from this their first estate and dwelling,

P

the

<sup>x</sup> Eph. vi. 12.

<sup>y</sup> Isa. xiv. 12.

the earth was not created; for the fall of the angels was a circumstance which must have happened before the world; because, as soon as the world was created, there was a devil ready to tempt and destroy mankind.

So that upon the whole, if he had maintained the very contrary, and asserted, not that angels were degraded from the direction of any provinces upon earth, but that they assumed their proper provinces in consequence of their degradation, he would have been much nearer the truth: for those evil spirits with whom we are in a state of warfare, are called *κόσμοκράτορες* *rulers of this world*<sup>2</sup>; and the devil himself is called the *prince of this world*. He is also termed the *prince of the power of the air*; and those evil spirits, the ministers of his subtle and destructive wiles, which hover in that element, like active and sharp-fighted birds of prey, are the *Dæmons* the author endeavours to obtrude upon us from the heathens, as beneficent ministers of the Almighty.

5. “ The prophet *Daniel* declares, that  
“ the angel *Gabriel* having touched him and  
“ spoken

<sup>2</sup> Eph. vi. 12.

“ spoken to him, said, that he was come to  
 “ make him understand what should befall  
 “ his people in the latter days, and that he  
 “ would have come sooner, but that the  
 “ prince (or ruling, or governing angel) of  
 “ the kingdom of Persia, withstood him one  
 “ and twenty days, till Michael one of the  
 “ chief princes, or as the Hebrew expresseth  
 “ it, the FIRST PRINCE came to help him<sup>a</sup>.”

It is wrong to suppose that the prophet *Daniel*, when he speaks (by the information of the angel) concerning the princes of *Persia* and *Græcia*, means (according to the author's metaphrase) governing angels: since it is plain, that he frequently refers to the then condition of those kingdoms, and prophecies concerning the changes of the *Persian* and *Græcian* empires; wherein, amongst the affairs of other princes, he alludes to those of *Alexander* and *Darius Codomannus*<sup>b</sup>; so that if the prophecy of *Daniel* be interpreted throughout according to this new plan, the battle of *Arbela* will appear to have been no other than the battle of the angels; we may, therefore, fairly

P 2

give

<sup>a</sup> *Essay* p. 45. *Dan.* x. 13.  
*Monarch.* p. 118, &c. p. 302. &c.

<sup>b</sup> See *Matthiæ Hist. Quat.*

give up all that he hath advanced upon the prophecy of *Daniel*; but before we dismiss it, it will be proper to obviate what he has offered about *Michael*, one of the chief princes, or the *first prince*: by which, and by another expression in the same prophecy—*MICHAEL the great prince, which standeth for the children of Israel*—he thinks it is intimated that as inferior angels were appointed to rule over other nations, so he was commissioned by God to rule over *Israel*.

He supposes all along that *Michael* is the same person with *Christ*; which I readily grant, and will give my reasons for granting this, though he hath not given his for supposing it. After which (though this subject more properly belongs to my next chapter) it shall be shewn, that *Michael* is not a created angel, and that he had not the direction of *Israel*) as the *author* asserts<sup>c</sup> assigned him by the Most High, as the portion of his inheritance.

First then, I am to shew that *Michael* and *Christ* are one and the same person.

There is no evidence, throughout the whole scripture, for a plurality of archangels:



gels: we hear only of one, who is *αρχων των αγγελων* (for such the word is, when given at length) *the head, or ruler of the angels*, he whom the angels were commanded to *worship*, as being his creatures and servants. And these angels, which in the book of *Revelation*, are called the *angels of Michael*, are likewise said to be the angels of *Christ*; for, *the Son of Man* (as he himself hath assured us) *shall come, in the glory of the Father, with HIS holy angels<sup>d</sup>*; and again, *the Son of Man shall send forth, at the end of the world, HIS angels<sup>e</sup>*. Therefore, as the angels have but *one ruler*, and are said to be the angels of *Michael*, and of the *Son of Man*, it necessarily follows, that *Michael* and the *Son of Man* are one and the same person. The same conclusion will follow, upon a comparison of the two following texts.—*The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, &c<sup>f</sup>*. which voice of the *archangel* is elsewhere said to be *the voice of the Son of Man*—*For the hour is coming, in the*  
*which,*

<sup>d</sup> Matt. xvi. 27.    <sup>e</sup> *Ibid.* xiii. 41.    <sup>f</sup> 1 Theff. iv. 16.

*which, all they that are in the graves, shall bear HIS voice, and come forth<sup>z</sup>.*

And thus is this matter rightly understood by the very learned and pious *John Gregory*, where, speaking of that voice, which shall awake the dead, he says, “nor shall it be  
“the voice of a God, and not of a man;  
“it shall be an human voice, for by the  
“*archangel* we are to mean the *Son of Man*,  
“for the hour is coming, &c<sup>h</sup>.”

The second proposition I am to make good is, that *Michael* is not a *created angel*.

The only passage wherein he is mentioned under the character of the *archangel*, is to be found in the epistle of St. *Jude*—v. 9.—*Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not (or was not bold to) bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee.* Now if we turn to the prophecy of *Zechariah*<sup>i</sup>, it will appear, that he who spake these words to the devil, as referred to by St. *Jude*, is there expressly characterized as a person of *Jehovah*. And *be shewed me*, says the prophet, *Joshua standing*

<sup>z</sup> John v. 25, 27, 28.

<sup>h</sup> *Postb. Works*, part 2. p. 62.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. iii. 12.

sta  
an  
bi  
L  
lat  
A  
pli  
de  
an  
jud  
th  
are  
the  
of  
ver  
bec  
Chr  
he  
nar  
-  
sec  
tha  
call  
of  
Go  
x  
Luk.

*standing before the ANGEL OF THE LORD,* and Satan *standing at his right hand to resist him,* and the Lord said unto Satan, the Lord rebuke thee; where the word translated, *the Lord,* is in both places *Jehovah.* As *Michael,* therefore, hath that name applied him, which without all controversy denotes *self-existence,* he cannot be a *created angel.* Nothing but an unreasonable prejudice to mere sounds, can dispose us to think, that because he is described as *the archangel* or *prince of the angelic host,* he is therefore of the number with those Beings, of whom he is the *head and ruler;* since the very same turn of argument will prove that because *God* is called the *king of kings,* or *Christ the prince of the kings of the earth*<sup>k</sup>, he is therefore the chief of *earthly monarchs,* and nothing more.

To what hath been said in relation to this second particular, it may farther be added, that the same host of celestial beings are called, not only the angels of *Michael* and of the *Son of Man,* but also the angels of *God the Father*<sup>l</sup>: from which intercommunity

<sup>k</sup> Rev. i. 5. Ἀρχὸν τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς.  
Luk. xii. 8. Heb. i. 6.

<sup>l</sup> Rev. iii. 5.

munity of appropriation I infer (and, I own, I do not see what can invalidate the inference) that as *Michael* and *Christ* appear from hence to be the same person, so it must also appear that *Christ* partakes of the same divine essence with God the Father, and is his co-equal in majesty, power, and dominion.

It is in the next place to be shewn, that *Christ* under the names of *Michael*, *Jehovah*, or the great prince which standeth for the children of Israel, had not "the care of that nation assigned to him by the Most High," as the portion of his inheritance; which proposition is by the *Essay* writer held in the affirmative<sup>m</sup>, and a great part of his work rests upon the supposed truth of it.

But if *Christ*, as the guide and protector of the children of *Israel*, was himself the *Most High*, it must carry with it a self-contradiction to say, that he had the care of that people assigned to him, as the portion of his inheritance, by the *Most High*. St. *Paul* observes, that some of the *Israelites* were destroyed in the wilderness, because they tempted CHRIST<sup>n</sup>, which the divinely inspired

<sup>m</sup> See *Essay*, P. 34, 45, 47, 48.

<sup>n</sup> 1 *Cor.* x. 9.



inspired *Psalmist* expresses by saying, that they *tempted the MOST HIGH GOD*°.

And again, it is certain that the kingdom of *Israel*, was not, according to the author's sense of the thing, assigned to *Christ* the second person of the Trinity, as to its guardian angel, because this very same kingdom is also appropriated to the *Holy Spirit*: for the prophet *David* in his *last* prophetic words, thus describes or entitles the divine Person, to whom he owed his inspiration—*The SPIRIT OF THE LORD spake by me—the GOD OF ISRAEL* said, &c.

We have now gone through all the arguments by which this *angelic* system of government, framed purely for the sake of ranking *Christ* with created angels, is supported. The author of them thinks they have given him a sufficient warrant for setting down the following conclusion—"It is manifest, that, according to the scriptures of the Old-testament," (he should have added "and of the New," since two of his arguments out of five are taken from it) "angels were appointed to preside over people and nations *upon earth*°." Not

Q

quite

° Psal. lxxviii. 56. conf. *Exod.* xvii. 2, 7.    P P. 47.

quite so manifest, I think, from the foregoing premises, which for our satisfaction we will, by recapitulating, take a short review of. The first is, a version of the LXX, which strongly favours of traditional *Judaism*, and contradicts the *Hebrew* text. 2. A quotation from an *apocryphal* book, wherein the word *κυβερν* is translated, *governing angel*. 3. An expression of *St. Paul*, relating to the *other world*. 4. The fall of angels *before the world*, alluded to by *St. Jude*. 5. The mention made of *human princes* by the prophet *Daniel*.

---

### CHAP III.

*His objections against the divinity of Christ answered.*

IT is high time for me to inform my reader that I have hitherto omitted to take notice of the *Jewish* evidence, alledged every now and then by the author in support of his opinions; and evidence in plenty he might have collected from *Jewish* writers, if it were possible for his opinions to  
be

be ten times worse than they really are. If their testimony were of any avail *against* the truth, Dr. *Middleton* would have stood a much fairer chance than he did, for shewing that the whole *law of Moses* was a mere human fiction, artfully framed by a cunning fellow, well versed in the *wisdom of Egypt*, to keep a superstitious and silly people under proper regulations<sup>1</sup>.

Our author "chuses to lay before his  
 " reader the opinion of the most sensible  
 " and learned among the *ancient Jews*, as  
 " he finds it very judiciously collected by  
 " *Eusebius* bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*,  
 " who must be allowed to be a tolerable  
 " judge, because he lived *amongst them* in  
 " the land of *Judæa*". What is it, that we must allow him to be a *tolerable judge of?* that the opinions he hath collected were *really Jewish?* no body denies it. But as *Eusebius* did not flourish till towards the latter end of the third century, when the *Jews* had been for three hundred years employed in evading the true sense of the scriptures, in order to baffle and defeat the fol-

Q 2

lowers

<sup>1</sup> See his quotations from *Josephus* cont. App. and *Philo* de exitu—in his *defence of the latter*, &c. p. 27, 41. \*P. 40.

lowers of *Jesus* ; how can it be expected that their impure comments should breathe the uncorrupt spirit of christianity ? These are the men, whom he gravely dignifies, in his title page, with the appellation of *ancient Hebrews*, that is, *modern Jews*, who had endeavoured to their utmost so to infect that air the Christians were to breathe in, as to breed a pestilence amongst them. Nay, the *author* himself, to the utter ruin of his whole scheme, as far as the *Jews* are concerned in it, confesses that ever “ since the  
 “ coming of our Saviour, not being wil-  
 “ ling to abide by the expositions given to  
 “ the Old-testament, they ran into number-  
 “ less absurd contrivances of expounding the  
 “ scriptures according to hidden and caba-  
 “ listical meanings,” of their own devising\*.

But these, he observes, were the *more modern Jews* ; that is, to use his own words, all the *Jews* who lived “ since the coming  
 “ of our Saviour” were *modern* ; and pray then, what sort of *Jews* must those have been, *amongst which* Eusebius lived ? for if they commenced *absurd* and *modern* upon *our Saviour’s coming*, how is it possible for them

\* P. 39, 40.



them to be *sensible* and *ancient*, three hundred years after it? As it appears that the author contradicts himself, I will shew that the *Jews* do the same, and then fairly dismiss them.

At page 41, we find a quotation from *Eusebius*, which extends nearly throughout three pages, the conclusion of which runs thus—" All the *Hebrew* divines, *after* that " God, who is *over all*, and *after* his first-born Wisdom, pay divine worship to the " third and holy power, which they call " the Holy Spirit." But what authority have these *Hebrew divines* for saying, that adoration is to be paid to the first-born Wisdom, AFTER that God who is over all; when a little backwarde in the same quotation, they confess, that this first-begotten of the Father *far exceeds all created beings*? The plain alternative is this, he is either a *created being*, or the *self-existent God*; but he cannot be a *created being*, because he *far exceeds all created beings*; if so, divine worship is not to be paid to him *after*, or in subordination to the Father, but upon an equality with him.

Again,

Again, he tells us, that “ the *Jews* made  
 “ a *second essence* of the *Logos*, which was  
 “ begotten by the *first cause*; and *Philo*  
 “ *Judæus* calls the *Logos* (δευτερος θεος)  
 “ a *second God*, in whose image man was  
 “ created.” It seems that *all the Hebrew*  
*divines* agree in these matters, and make the  
*Logos* a *secondary God*, one who is to receive  
 a sort of divine adoration, inferior to that  
 paid to *God, who is over all*. Now, I have  
 the authority of a *Jew* for affirming, that  
*all the Hebrew divines* maintain the very  
 contrary, and confess that the *Logos*, or se-  
 cond person of the *Trinity*, under another  
 name, that of the *redeeming angel*, is strictly  
 and properly to be esteemed *the very God*.  
 For *rabbi Moses* thus gives his opinion con-  
 cerning the divine person, who appeared to  
*Joshua* under an human shape, as *captain*  
*of the Lord's host*: “ This angel,” says the  
 above-named *Hebrew* divine, “ is the *An-*  
 “ *gel-Redeemer*, who in *Exod.* xxxiii. 14.  
 “ is called the *face of God*; but the *face of*  
 “ *God* signifies *GOD HIMSELF*, as *ALL IN-*  
 “ *TERPRETERS* confess; of this same angel  
 “ it

“ it is said, *my name* (the incommunicable  
“ name *Jehovah*) *is in him*.”

As there can be no perfect coincidence between the present *Jewish* plan, and the *Christian*, the only possible use that can be made of their writings is, to extract such parts of them, as contradict the apostate scheme, and to turn their own weapons backward upon themselves; which design hath been admirably well executed by the deeply learned *Raymund Martini*, in his *Pugio Fidei*; who by searching with indefatigable labour into all the combined efforts of this *synagogue of Satan*\*, hath set forth an whole volume of their unguarded concessions, which as oft as they are pointed toward the main body of their detestable fictions, must, like a scorpion striking itself to death with its own sting, give so many mortal wounds to the general strain of their extravagant interpretations.

We know, that in the time of our blessed Saviour, the scribes and lawyers among the  
*Jews,*

\* *Iste angelus est angelus Redemptor, qui est facies Dei. Exod. xxxiii. 14. Atqui facies Dei significat IPSUM DEUM, ut fatentur OMNES interpretes. De hoc dicitur, nomen meum in eo est.—Cred by Fagius, upon Josh. v. 14-      \* Rev. ii. 9. and iii. 9.*

*Jews*, who ought to have been, men *instructed*, by the sacred oracles, *into the kingdom of God*, had *taken away the key of knowledge*; and it is no where recorded, that from that day to this they ever returned it. Nay, ever from that time forwards, they grew continually worse and worse, as to their knowledge of the holy scripture; which they searched only to pervert; and being instigated by the most infernal malice against *Him*, instead of whom they had desired a murderer to be released unto them, fell into as great a degree of blindness as those men of *Sodom*, who *wearied themselves to find the door* of the house, with the desperate resolution of affronting the divine persons inclosed within it. And though to us, who enter in by *Christ*, the *way*, the *truth*, and the *life*, the scripture is clear and open; yet to them it is as fast shut and closed, as that den into which the prophet *Daniel* was cast, with a stone laid upon the mouth of it, and sealed with the signet of heaven: nor hath the *purpose* of the king yet been *changed* concerning them.

Whatever therefore *Pbilo* and his brethren may have been pleased to utter, about  
the



the *second cause*, the *most ancient of angels*, the *guardian of Israel*, and the *archangel subsisting with many names*—away with it all; let it return to the place from whence it came; and as a final answer to the author upon this head, and to caution my reader against that trash of *Judaism*, with which the *Essay on spirit* hath presented us; let me subjoin that earnest injunction of *St. Paul* to *Timothy*, given at a time, when it may reasonably be supposed, that there were many and much more antient writings of this sort extant—GIVE NO HEED TO JEWISH FABLES.

We are now to enter upon the *Essay-writer's* objections against the divinity of *Christ*; most of which, instead of being sound arguments, are misapplied texts of scripture, weak surmises, and groundless assertions; but that my work may be the shorter and the easier, I shall first beg leave to lay before the reader a few propositions, which, I apprehend, no *Christian* will, and no man of learning can, dispute the truth of, desiring only, that as they are very important, he will give them a serious and attentive consideration.

R

Prop.

*Prop. I.* The name יהוה *Jehovah* doth express absolute *self-existence*.

*Prop. II.* There is but ONE *being* or *essence*, to which this *name* can be applied—*Hear O Israel, Jehovah our God, is ONE JEHOVAH, Deut. vi. 4.* which our *Saviour* himself affirms to be, the very first article of the *first of all the commandments*<sup>x</sup>.

*Prop. III.* This *name* is applied, *ex concessio*, to *three persons*, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

*Prop. IV.* If so applied, it must denote, that these *three persons* are, after some ineffable manner, really and truly ONE; because, by *Prop. 2.* there is but ONE JEHOVAH.

*Prop. V.* The fall of mankind was occasioned by an offence against the *supreme God*, not against any *created angel*.

*Prop. VI.* The salvation of mankind is not to be effected by the union of our nature with *created angels*, but with the *supreme God*.—*God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself. 2 Cor. v. 19.*

*Prop. VII.* We are to be reconciled and united to *him*, by means of *his* union with the

<sup>x</sup> *Mark xii. 29.*

the human body of *Christ*.—*There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.*

Having premised thus much, I proceed to the objections :

I. The first of which is borrowed from an *apocryphal* book of scripture—For “ the  
“ wise son of *Sirach*, says our author, when  
“ speaking of the guardian angel of *Israel*,  
“ under the name of *Wisdom*, says, *I came*  
“ *out of the mouth of the Most High*—He  
“ *that MADE me caused me to rest, and said,*  
“ *let thy dwelling be in Jacob, and thine in-*  
“ *heritance in Israel. He CREATED me in*  
“ *the beginning, before the world, and I*  
“ *shall never fail, &c<sup>y</sup>.*”

Upon this he remarks, that this being must be understood to have been made and created, in the same sense as the light, when God said, *let there be light, and there was light*; and immediately after this, speaking by a figure of rhetoric, commonly called *tautology*, he says, “ it is *likewise* to be observed (as if he had not observed it before)  
“ that this angel of *Israel* is here declared  
“ to have been a *created being*, in terms as

R 2

plain

“ plain as it is in the power of language to  
 “ express.” Very true, so it is, and we  
 would have granted it, without being twice  
 told of it: but by what authority does he  
 attempt either to establish, or unsettle any  
 point of faith, from a book, which with  
 good and sufficient reasons, we hold as un-  
 canonical? Besides, it must be noted, that  
 the *Wisdom of Sirach*, as we now have it, is  
 nothing more than a *Greek* translation of an  
*Hebrew* original, in which we have some  
 reason to suppose, that the term *created* was  
 not to be found, because it is not used in that  
 passage of the book of *Proverbs*, of which  
 this is a plain imitation, and from whence  
 the next objection is drawn.

II. For to the afore-mentioned observa-  
 tion, it is immediately added—“ In the  
 “ same kind of style (with the above passage  
 “ from the *son of Sirach*) it is, that *Solomon*,  
 “ speaking—in the person, and under the  
 “ character of *wisdom*, faith, *Jehovah* pos-  
 “ sessed me in the beginning of his ways, be-  
 “ fore his works of old: I was set up from  
 “ everlasting, from the beginning, or ever  
 “ the earth was; when there were no depths,  
 “ I



" I WAS BROUGHT FORTH, &c." The word CREATED was plainly for his purpose, and, therefore, agreeable to his unhandsome and disingenuous method of proceeding, he *first* lays hold of that, and afterwards would have us suppose, that *Solomon* speaking in the same kind of stile, makes a declaration to the very same effect: as if the book of *Proverbs* were an imitation of the *Wisdom of Sirach*, not the *Wisdom of Sirach* an imitation of that.

The *Arians*, in the days of *Atbanasius*, laid a great stress upon this passage, in a manner putting the success of their whole cause upon the issue of it. They borrowed their sense of it from the *Septuagint*, which renders the words, יהוה קנני, *The Lord created me*; and descanted upon the word *created*, with as much confidence, as our author does upon the same word, borrowed from the *son of Sirach*<sup>a</sup>: whereas the passage, when read in the original *Hebrew*, or in the *English* version, which rightly translates it, loses all its force, and becomes incapable of such an application.

But

<sup>a</sup> P. 52. Prov. viii. 22, &c. <sup>a</sup> The words of *Cornelius a Lapide* upon this occasion are—Hic locus erat *Achilles Arianorum*, quo Christum creaturam esse probarunt, quia hic dicitur, Deus ex terra me, creavit me.

But the Primitive Fathers, in order to clear up the whole, did not understand this of the divinity, but of the *humanity* of *Christ*, which they supposed to be here spoken of, in the same kind of stile; as where he is said to be *the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world*: to this purpose *Athanasius* instructs us, that *Solomon* “ doth not say, *he created me before his* “ *works*, that we should receive it as spoken “ of the divinity of the *Logos*; since it was “ the God-man, who (as man) was created “ *the beginning<sup>b</sup> of his ways*, whom he “ afterwards manifested to us for our sal- “ vation.” The same is declared by *Epiphanius*, vol. I. 748. And *Pole* upon this place, referring to *Salmazar*, who has collected their opinions, tells us, that the Fathers unanimously applied this passage to the humanity, or human soul of the *Messiah*. The most ancient of the *Jews* likewise, after their manner of expressing the thing, held that the *soul of the Messiah* was created

<sup>b</sup> The original is not *בראשית*, in the beginning, as our *English* version supposes it to be, but *ראשית*, the beginning. See what *St. Jerom* says upon the words *ראשית* and *αρχη*, in his comment on the 7th verse of *Psal. xl.* (in him the xxxixth.) Vol. III. p. 130. Ed. *Par.*

created before the world: and what is very remarkable, in that little short prologue, which is set down before the description *Wisdom* gives of herself in the book of *Ecclesiasticus*, it is said, *Wisdom shall praise HERSELF* (as *we* render it) but the *Greek* is  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ , *her SOUL*. To this, it may be added, that most of the ancient theological writers, in strict agreement with the holy scriptures themselves, have determined, that Christ appeared as *man* to the patriarchs and prophets, long before his incarnation.

III. I have laboured hard to give the form of an argument to the next objection, but find the difficulty insurmountable. "*Philo Judæus*," it seems, "observes that " the *archangel with many names*, was also " called by the *name of God*:" and then the author proceeds to shew from many places of scripture, " that the angel which " acted as a guardian-angel to the seed of " *Abraham*, and presided over the children " of *Israel*, is called *Jehovah*." From whence, he would conclude, I presume, that the name *Jehovah* is applied to a creat-  
ed



*ed angel.* But in all this, I cannot for my life discover where his *medium* of proof lies; *Philo* says, that the *archangel* with many names is called by the *name of God*—we find that the angel, which presided over the children of *Israel*, is called *Jehovah*—and therefore—nothing ! absolutely nothing ! for when these premises are laid together and compared, they cannot possibly supply us with any conclusion in the world.

As for the instances the *author* has offered from the Old Testament, in order to shew, that the same person, who is said to be the *angel of Jehovah*, is likewise mentioned under the direct name of *Jehovah*; before these can be of any service to him, there are two very important questions to be settled: the first is, whether the word *angel*, as used in the scripture, must in all cases signify a *created being*? The second is, whether the name *Jehovah*, which denotes *self-existence*, can be applied to such a being? If both of these questions were determined in the affirmative, he would then have instanced something to the purpose: but to beg them both, and proceed to his instances, without clearing a passage to them,



is a small oversight in one, who thinks himself authorized by the peculiar strength of his reasonings, to triumph over the *unthinking herd*, for running head-long into indefensible opinions, merely because their fathers did so before them.

I shall therefore not trouble either myself or my reader with the tedious labour of setting all these misapplied instances in their proper light; but observe only, that the word *angel*, as signifying literally<sup>a</sup>, *one that is sent*, may, and must be applied to the Second and Third Persons of the ever blessed Trinity; because, according to those offices of *redemption* and *sanctification*, they have mercifully condescended to take upon them in the œconomy of grace, they are both said to be *sent* by the Father<sup>c</sup>.

IV. The next objection is taken from that declaration of *Jehovah* to *Moses*, wherein it is asserted, that the *face of Jehovah* could not be *seen*, because, said he, *there shall no man see me and live*. But yet at the same time we are told that *Jehovah* made *all his goodness to pass before Moses*, and permitted him to behold his *back-parts*,

<sup>a</sup> מלאך.

S

<sup>c</sup> אחר, John v. 23.—xiv. 26.

יָהוָה, which the *author* renders, *what followed him*. From whence he argues, that there must have been *two Jehovahs*, that is, a *visible Jehovah* following the *invisible*<sup>f</sup>. But since, as the fact stands recorded, it is not said that *Moses saw* the face of any *Jehovah*; and as it is not possible that there should be two *Jehovahs*, the one distinct from the other, unless the first article of the first of all the commandments is a self-contradiction; I pass this over without any farther notice. See Prop. 1. 4.

V. The fifth objection presents us once more with the same impossibility, the existence of two *Jehovahs*. For the author sets down the following passage from the Prophet *Zechariah*—*Sing and rejoice, O daughters of Zion; for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith Jehovah—and thou shalt know that the Jehovah of Hosts hath sent me unto thee*<sup>g</sup>: and then observes, that “the *Jehovah of Zion* is “plainly distinguished from the *Jehovah of Hosts*, and acknowledgeth himself to be “sent by him<sup>h</sup>.” It proves, on the contrary, that the *sender* and the *sent*, are essentially

<sup>f</sup> *Ess.* p. 60, 61. *Exod.* xxxiii. 19, &c.

<sup>g</sup> *Zech.* iii. 10, 11.

<sup>h</sup> *P.* 65.

entially one. Nor is the *Jehovah of Zion* distinguished from the *Jehovah of Hosts*; because, the very person, whom the author here supposes to be distinguished from the *supreme Jehovah*, or God the Father, by the former name, is also expressly dignified with the latter. For, saith the Prophet *Isaiab*, mine eyes have SEEN the King, the JEHOVAH OF HOSTS<sup>1</sup>, which when compared with *John xii. 41.* settles the point: *These things said Esaias, when he SAW his glory (the glory of Christ) and spake of him.*

VI. The sixth is not an objection, but a demonstration against himself; and I cannot conceive how he came to start it: for, taking it as granted that there are two *Jehovahs*, a superior and an inferior, he is pleased to observe hereupon, “ that this  
 “ *Jehovah of Zion* (whom I have just  
 “ proved to be the *supreme God*) does not  
 “ always declare himself to be deputed,  
 “ but actually and literally speaks in his  
 “ own name, and calls himself *Jehovah*,  
 “ and saith, *I am the God of Abraham*;  
 “ and, *I am the God of Bethel*; and, *I*  
 S 2 “ brought

<sup>1</sup> Isa. vi. 5.

" brought thee out of the land of Egypt, &c.  
 " and positively prohibits *Moses* and the  
 " children of *Israel* from worshipping any  
 " other God but himself: *thou*, says he,  
 " shalt have no other Gods before me: there-  
 " by seeming to forbid even the worship  
 " of the supreme *Jehovah*, the *Jehovah* of  
 " *Hoshs* \*." That is, in other words—  
 when the God, who brought the children  
 of *Israel* out of *Egypt*, commands them to  
 worship him, as the one only object of ado-  
 ration, he seems thereby to forbid the wor-  
 ship of another God superior to himself.  
 No: he thereby forbids the worship of all  
*inferior* Gods, and asserts that he himself is  
 the *supreme*: for the argument, when drawn  
 up, will stand thus—The *supreme* God is to  
 be worshipped—but no other God, except  
 him who brought the children of *Israel* out  
 of *Egypt*, is to be worshipped—therefore,  
 the God, who brought the children of *Israel*  
 out of *Egypt* is the *supreme* God. Here is a  
 plain demonstration against him; nor can I  
 foresee how it is possible for him to vindicate  
 this absurd notion, of a *Jehovah* affirm-  
 ing himself to be the sole object of worship,  
 when



when all the while, he must not be supposed to mean himself, but another *Jebo-  
vab*<sup>1</sup>. " It is to be observed, says he, that  
" the *Hebrews* were far from being explicit  
" and accurate in their stile, but left great  
" room for the imagination of the reader  
" to supply and fill up the deficiencies<sup>m</sup>." Never was there a cavil so contemptible, opposed to an argument so important! and it is a lamentable consideration, that the *Holy Ghost* hath not an *accuracy in his stile*, sufficient to preserve his readers from falling into idolatry. Besides, we may learn from this observation, that the capital doctrine of the whole scriptures is to be settled, not from what is said, but from what is not; not from the express words of scripture, but from what the *imagination* is to *supply*; which, according to the fancy of every different reader, may supply just what it pleases.

## VII.

<sup>1</sup> Liqueat, veteribus *Judaïs* nunquam in mentem venisse commentum illud, quod nostro seculo viris quibusdam doctis inter Christianos placuit; nempe eum, qui *Mosi* in rubo & monte *Sinai* apparuit & locutus est, merum fuisse angelum, qui se Deum *Abrahami* appellaret, *Deique nomine* cultum divinum, sibi adhibitum, libenter admitteret. Nimirum absurda nimis, & plane horrenda est illa sententia. *Bulli Def. Fid. Nic.* Sect. I. cap. I. §. 11.

<sup>m</sup> P. 66.

VII. I pass therefore on to the next objection, which is a passage from St. Paul<sup>a</sup> :  
 “ For, says this Apostle, *though there be*  
 “ *that are called Gods, whether in heaven*  
 “ *or in earth (for there be Gods many, and*  
 “ *Lords many) yet to us there is but one*  
 “ *God, the Father, of whom are all things,*  
 “ *and we in him ; and one Lord Jesus Christ,*  
 “ *by whom are all things, and we by him.*  
 “ That is, there is but one supreme God,  
 “ in comparison of whom, there is *none*  
 “ *other but he*, and with regard to whom  
 “ Jesus the Christ is to be called *Lord*, and  
 “ not God<sup>o</sup>.” In the verse immediately  
 preceding those which are here quoted, the  
 Apostle gives a clear explanation of his  
 meaning, by declaring the very same thing  
 in a few words, *we know*, says he, *that an*  
*idol is nothing in the world, and that there is*  
*no other God but one.* After which, in the  
 words now before us, he draws a contrast  
 more at large, between the belief of *ido-*  
*laters*, and that of *Christians*, opposing the  
 one only and true God, to that tribe of ce-  
 lestial and terrestrial deities, which by the  
 Heathens were *called Gods*, but, in reality,  
 were

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6.<sup>o</sup> P. 87.

were nothing in the world. The author imagines, that the Apostle here means to draw a *comparison* between the supreme God, and subordinate angels: for, says he, "the term of *God* is to be attributed to the Son, as when we say, *there be Gods many.*" But if *we* say it at all, we must say it in the sense St. Paul did, and then it will make an idol of him, who is *God over all, blessed for evermore.*

It should here be observed, that when the scripture speaks of *one God*, it doth certainly express the *unity* of the blessed Trinity; and the appellation of *the Father*, ascribed to the *one God*, upon which he lays so great a stress, doth not here mean the *person* of the *Father* in severance from the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, but denotes, as it does in many other places of the scripture, the *fulness of the Godhead*, or that *essence*, to an union with which, the *manhood* of *Christ* was exalted. Which is well observed by *Athanasius*, who affirms, that *the Father* is frequently taken for the *fulness of the Godhead*, which dwelt in the body of *Christ*, and is therefore called *his God*, *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ σωτῆρος* *τῷ Χριστῷ*. And certain it is, that there are

many passages of scripture, which demand such an explanation : of which sort is — *the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ* <sup>2</sup>; and again — *For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he GIVEN to the Son to have life in himself.* That is, as *Jehovah* hath life essential in himself, so hath he given to the man Christ Jesus a communication of the same life, by uniting him to the essence of the Godhead.

But he carries on this objection in such a manner, that I shall be able to turn his own artillery upon him. For this “ God the “ Father, says he, *St. Paul* characterizes as “ that God, who is *the blessed and ONLY “ Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord “ of Lords, WHO ONLY hath immortality, “ dwelling in the light which no man can “ approach unto, WHOM NO MAN HATH “ SEEN, OR CAN SEE.*” This he allows to be a description of the *one only and supreme God*; but, it is a description of Christ. This is evident, first, from the context; which, when the connection is preserved, runs thus — *Keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord*

<sup>2</sup> Eph i. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16.



*Lord Jesus Christ, which he (the Lord Jesus Christ himself) shall shew, who (Christ) is the blessed and only Potentate, &c.* Secondly, because the *appearing of Christ*, here spoken of, *Christ himself* through the power of the Godhead in him is to manifest at the end of the world; just as it is said of him after his resurrection, *on this wise SHEWED HE HIMSELF*<sup>r</sup>. But thirdly and chiefly, because *Christ* is dignified with all those very attributes, which are here ascribed to the supreme God; and we may take all the articles separately, and find parallels to them throughout. First, *who is the blessed and only Potentate*—so of *Christ* it is elsewhere said, that he *is the head of all principality and power*<sup>s</sup>. 2. *The King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*—so—*he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS*<sup>t</sup>. 3. *Who only hath immortality*—so—*in him was LIFE*<sup>u</sup>. 4. *Who dwelleth in the light which no man can approach unto*—so—*the city (the heavenly Jerusalem) had no need of the sun, for the glory of God did lighten it, and THE LAMB IS THE LIGHT THEREOF*<sup>w</sup>.

T

I

<sup>r</sup> John xxi. 1.<sup>s</sup> Col. ii. 10.<sup>t</sup> Rev.<sup>u</sup> John i. 4.<sup>w</sup> Rev. xxi. 23.

I need not run this parallel through the last article, the *invisibilty* of the Godhead, because it is to be considered in a different capacity, as it furnishes the author with his next objection.

VIII. For, as concerning "the one, only, "invisible God," he affirms very roundly, "that he cannot POSSIBLY be the same "with that God, who *was manifested in "the flesh* \*." But by this manifestation, none have ever been so weak as to imagine, that the Godhead became *visible*, any farther than by its immediate union with that *flesh*, which *was* visible: for when *Christ* became incarnate, though we did not see God, yet we saw the ~~person who was~~ God.

Without insisting afresh upon that description of *the Father*, (as he will have it) or, *one, only, invisible God*, which I have just now proved applicable to *Christ*; I shall set down two expressions, which at once must silence all cavils and disputes: for *Christ* affirms of the unbelieving *Jews*, that *they had both SEEN and hated, both him and his FATHER* †: and again he says to one of his

\* P. 88. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

† Joh. xv. 24.

his disciples—*He that hath seen me, hath*  
 SEEN THE FATHER<sup>2</sup>.

IX. His next argument runs through 16 of his *sections*<sup>a</sup>, in which he hath collected many texts wherein *Christ* is mentioned, as receiving power from God—being *anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows* (mankind) being *made* Lord and *Christ*—raised from the dead—exalted to the right hand of God, &c. all of which relate to the human nature, and cannot possibly afford any evidence for the inferiority of the divine. And let it here be recollected, that the salvation of mankind does not depend upon the exaltation of a God, or of any other being, but of man only, who fell from God by sin, and through the *man Christ Jesus*, is re-united to him. It must be observed though, that four of the above sections begin with, *and as the Jews*, in which we are obliged with a repetition of that Rabbinical evidence, which hath already received its answer, at the beginning of this chapter.

X. “To declare the *Father* and the *Son*  
 “to be *co-equal* and *co-eternal*, is by no

T 2

“ means

<sup>a</sup> John xiv. 9. <sup>2</sup> From p. 89, to 106.

“ means consistent with the relation that  
 “ there is between father and son <sup>b</sup>.” With  
 that relation, as it subsists among *men*, it is  
 not: but this is no reason, why it should  
 not be so with *God*; or even, that in all  
 created beings it should be an inconsistency.  
 As for example—*Light* is the offspring of  
*fire*, and yet *co-eval* with it; for it is im-  
 possible to conceive a time, when the sun  
 existed without emitting light; and were  
 the sun eternal, light would be co-eternal  
 with it: as was very judiciously observed by  
 Mr. *Leslie* <sup>c</sup> to the *Unitarians*, many years  
 ago, and it is not answered yet.

XI. “ If the substance of the Father be  
 “ the same undivided substance with the  
 “ Son, and the substance of the Son be-  
 “ came incarnate, then it will follow that  
 “ the substance of the Father became in-  
 “ carnate also <sup>d</sup>.” If he had used the word  
*person* instead of *substance*, there would have  
 been no difficulty in this: but purely to  
 raise the difficulty, and perplex us with  
 wrong terms, he considers God as united to  
 man, in that respect only, in which God is  
 but

<sup>b</sup> P. 141. <sup>c</sup> Theolog. works, fol. vol. I. p. 227.

<sup>d</sup> P. 148.



but ONE ; not as the scripture and the church does, in that respect in which he is THREE.

XII. The last objection I shall take notice of, is drawn from the hypostatical union of the two natures in the person of *Christ*, and is as follows—" If this proposition, says he, be taken for granted, which may be found *totidem verbis* in the *Athanasian* creed, that *as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ* ; and if this other proposition be allowed, which is to be found as explicitly in the scriptures, that this one *Christ* suffered for the sins of mankind ; then it must follow, of consequence, that *Christ* suffered in his *godhead*, as well as his humanity ; since otherwise, it would have been the *man Jesus*, and not *Jesus the Messiah*, or *Christ*, that suffered for the sins of men<sup>s</sup>."

Hitherto he hath objected as an *Arian*, and talked about the *most antient of angels*, &c. but now, he is changed on a sudden into the character of a *Socinian* : for this very argument hath ever been advanced and

I

insisted

\* Ibid.

insisted upon by them, to prove that *Christ* was nothing more than a mere man; because, say they, if God became an individual person with man, God must have *suffered*; which it is not possible for him to do. In answer to this, I must recommend to his consideration the two following texts; and if he can, either under the character of an *Arian*, or a *Socinian*, get clear of them, he may proceed with his objection; till he does this, he cannot be qualified to it.—*Herein is the love of GOD, that HE LAID DOWN HIS LIFE for us.* And again—*The church, which GOD hath purchased with HIS OWN BLOOD.* It is incumbent upon him therefore, if he believes the divine authority of the holy scriptures, to shew us, that these passages do not prove, that the *person*, who suffered for us upon the cross *as man*, was *God* as well as man<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>a</sup> N. B. These three last objections are intermixed with his remarks upon the creeds.

## CH A P. IV.

*Objections to the divinity of the Holy Ghost answered.*

“I. **T**HE Holy Spirit must be an intelligent agent, separate and distinct from God, because he is said to be *sent* by him: for it is manifest that God cannot *send* himself; because those terms imply a contradiction<sup>1</sup>.” It hath already been proved<sup>k</sup>, that the *sender* and the *sent* may be essentially one; and as for the supposed *contradiction* of God’s *sending himself*, it arises merely from his begging of the question, that there is but one *person* in the divine essence; but the scripture shews that there are *three*, which takes the contradiction away.

II. His next objection is an inference drawn from the following expression — *Jehovah and his Spirit*<sup>l</sup>, as if, by the usage of the particle *and*, it must necessarily follow, that they are separate and distinct beings. But neither will this observation hold any

<sup>1</sup> P. 78.<sup>k</sup> See the preceding chapter, Sect. 5.<sup>l</sup> Ibid.—Isa. xlviii. 16.

any more than the former; for *Christ* thus expresses himself—*I AND my Father are ONE*; where, though the particle *and* may seem to disjoin the Father from the Son, yet the whole sentence expressly asserts their union: and St. *John*, speaking of the whole three persons, calls them *the Father, the Word, AND the Holy Ghost*, and yet adds—*and these three are ONE*. So likewise, when our Lord commanded his disciples to baptize *in the name of the Father, AND of the Son, AND of the Holy Ghost*, though he inserts the particle *and*, upon which the author grounds his argument, yet he withal expresses the *unity* of the Trinity: for tho' *three persons* are mentioned, he bids them not baptize in the names, but (*εις το ονομα*) in *THE NAME*; upon which the excellent Bp. *Andrews* thus comments—“ If we  
 “ will stay yet, but a little, at our baptism,  
 “ and hearken well; as we hear that the  
 “ Holy Ghost is God, so shall we that he  
 “ is God in *Unity*. For there we hear but,  
 “ in *nomine*, but of *one name*. Now as the  
 “ *Apostle* reasoneth (Gal. iii. 16.) *Abrahæ*  
 “ *dictæ sunt promissiones & semini ejus. Non*  
 “ *dicit*



" *dicat seminibus, quasi in multis; sed, tan-*  
 " *quam in uno, semini ejus.* To Abraham;  
 " and his seed, were the promises made;  
 " he saith not to the seeds as of many, but  
 " to his seed, as of one. So we are bapti-  
 " zed, *non in nominibus, quasi multis; sed*  
 " *in nomine, quasi uno*; not in the names,  
 " as of many, but in the name, as of one:  
 " one name, and one nature or essence.  
 " *Unum sumus* (saith Christ) of two of them:  
 " *unum sunt* saith St. John of all three;  
 " this we hear there."

III. " In the books of Judges and Sa-  
 " muel, it is not said, that it was *Jehovah*,  
 " but the *Spirit of Jehovah*, which came  
 " upon Othniel, and Gideon, and Jephtha,  
 " and Sampson, and Saul, and David, to  
 " assist them in the government of Israel,  
 " and the execution of their office." The  
 last objection was built upon a particle of  
*three* letters; that now before us, hath no-  
 thing more to rest upon, than the slender  
 foundation of *two*; for he affirms, it is not  
 said, that it was *Jehovah* himself, but the  
*Spirit of Jehovah*, which inspired and actu-

U

ated

" *Sermons* P. 642.    " *Ibid.* See Judg. iii. 10.—vi. 34.  
 —ix. 29.—xiii. 25. 1 Sam. x. 6.—xvi. 13.

ated the illustrious persons above-mentioned.

But the very first instance he refers us to for a proof of this assertion, shews us, on the contrary, that the same person, who is said to be the *Spirit of Jehovah*, is likewise mentioned under the direct name of *Jehovah* himself, which the *author* is pleased to affirm he is not. For of *Othniel* it is said, that *the SPIRIT OF JEHOVAH came upon him, and he judged Israel, and went out to war; and JEHOVAH (the same spirit, which enabled him to go out to war) delivered the king of Mesopotamia into his hand.* In like manner, the *Spirit of Jehovah* is asserted to be very *God*, in the passage he refers to concerning *Saul*; for the prophecy of *Samuel* with relation to this matter, is thus worded—*The SPIRIT OF JEHOVAH will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man: and let it be, when these signs are come unto thee, that thou do as occasion shall serve, for GOD is (or will be) with thee.*

IV. “ *St. John* plainly calleth that *Holy Spirit* by which he was inspired with the “ *book of Revelations*, an *angel*: for this “ *revelation* was signified to *St. John* by an “ *angel*

“ angel sent from *Christ*; and yet through  
 “ the whole book he calls this revelation  
 “ the dictates of *the Spirit*. *He that hath*  
 “ *an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith*  
 “ *unto the churches*.” In this we have a

grand specimen of the author's talent in explaining the scripture; for the words here set down, were not spoken by the *angel*, or by St. *John*, but by *Christ* himself, from among *the seven golden candlesticks*. This is a sufficient answer; but I cannot leave this remark without first admitting it to be true, and then tracing a flat contradiction or two, which must of necessity follow from it. First, if that angel, which signified to St. *John* the scenes described in the book of *Revelations*, was the *Holy Spirit*; then, as it was but one and the same angel of *Jesus Christ*, which, from beginning to end, presented all these things before his imagination, it follows, that the *Holy Spirit* is not to be worshipped; because, when St. *John* offered to pay adoration to the angel, which signified or shewed to him the things he then heard and saw, he was forbid to do it,

U 2

and

¶ P. 106. Rev. ii. 7, 11, 17—iii. 6, 13.    ¶ *Ibid* i. 13—  
 18, &c.    ¶ Chap. i. v. 1. Ch. ult. v. 16.

and at the same time directed to the one only proper object of worship, the supreme God<sup>s</sup>. Again, as this angel declared to St. John that he was his *fellow-servant*, and of his brethren the prophets<sup>t</sup>; then, if this angel was the *Holy Spirit*, it must appear, that he is a *fellow-servant* with the prophets which he inspired, that is, bound to SERVE or worship the same God: but—all scripture is given by *inspiration* of God<sup>u</sup>—and then, if any thing follows, it is, that God is to *worship* himself.

V. “Although the Virgin Mary is positively said to have been *found with child* “*of the Holy Spirit*, and to have *conceived* “*of the Holy Spirit*; yet the person sent to “her from God upon this occasion, calls “himself an angel, and in particular, *the* “*angel Gabriel that standeth in the presence* “*of God*.” The angel Gabriel was sent from God to forewarn the Virgin of a future efficacy from the *Holy Spirit*, and speaks of the *Holy Spirit* (whom he characterizes as the *Most High*) as of another person; not that he himself was the *Holy Spirit*, as the  
author

<sup>s</sup> V. 9.    <sup>t</sup> *Ibid.*    <sup>u</sup> 2 Tim. iii. 16.    <sup>v</sup> P. 107—  
Matt. i. 18, 20. Luke i. 19, 26.



author imagines, and seems to be so pleased with the discovery, that he thinks it something *very remarkable*.

Now we are upon this subject, I must beg leave to remind him, that *Jesus*, the *holy thing which was born* of the *Virgin Mary*, was called the *Son of God*, because he was begotten of the *Holy Ghost*; which on more accounts than one, deserves his very serious consideration, and he would do well to clear it up. The very same truth may be collected from many other passages of holy writ; but the following instance may be sufficient—*GOD, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the Fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his SON\**: which *GOD*, who spake in time past by the *prophets*, and in the latter days by *his Son*, is by *St. Peter* called the *Holy Ghost*: for says he, *in old time, holy men of God, the prophets, that is, spake as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST†*.

From all which, it manifestly appears, as I have already observed, that the whole undivided godhead, is in the scripture frequently

\* Heb. i. 1, 2,      † 2 Pet. i. 21, conf. Luke i. 68, &c.

quently represented as the *Father* of the *man Jesus*, and that the *Holy Spirit*, which begat him of the Virgin, is the very and supreme God, because the angel *Gabriel* calls *his* power, the *power of the HIGHEST*<sup>2</sup>. Nay, the very *devils* themselves, could with a *loud voice*, call out upon *Jesus* their conqueror, as the *Son of the most HIGH GOD*<sup>3</sup>; and here the author introduces what he supposes to be a created and subordinate angel upon this occasion.

Now we have gone through all the arguments, offered in the *Essay*, with the intent of degrading the Son and Holy Spirit, down to the rank of created beings; it will be proper to enquire, how the writer of it, in allowing them divine worship, can possibly clear himself from the charge of *idolatry*, which the *Arians*, upon their principles, have never yet been able to do? Why, he confesses "that angels, as angels, have no right to divine worship or adoration on their own account; but when angels are commissioned from God, with any degree of power over us" (which they never are, being only *ministring spirits*)

<sup>2</sup> Luke i. 35.<sup>3</sup> Matt. v. 7.

rits) “ and are sent in his name ; then it  
 “ cannot be idolatry to pay them a propor-  
 “ tionate degree of adoration ; because such  
 “ adoration or worship not being paid them  
 “ on their own account, but on account of  
 “ the authority which hath been delegated  
 “ to them, terminates in the one only and  
 “ supreme God <sup>b</sup>.”

Thus the difficulty is solved ! we are not guilty of idolatry in paying divine adoration to *creatures*, because in them we worship God ; which is the very excuse *Bartkolomew Malam<sup>c</sup>* gave for himself, when he knelt down and worshipped *George Fox* the Quaker ; saying, that he did not worship *George Fox* himself, but *the light in George Fox* ; that is, he adored the said *George Fox*, not upon his own account, as *George Fox*, but as one commissioned from God, with a degree of power over us, raised by the irresistible workings of the Spirit, from the state of a mechanick, to that of an inspired preacher, a son of thunder uttering a voice upon Mount Sion, from the four winds, and sent in the name of God. If the learned will pardon me, for mentioning the name of *Cicero*, in the

<sup>b</sup> P. 82, 83.

<sup>c</sup> *Leffie Theol. Works* Vol. 2. p. 619.

the same page, with that of the most illiterate *George Fox*; I think the compliment he makes *Scipio Africanus* pay to *Publius*, "*scito te deum esse*," proceeded from a like principle with that above-mentioned: so that *Bartholomew Malam* did nothing more than sing a sober *te deum* to *George Fox*, as the great *Scipio* did to *Publius*, and as the *Essay-writer* would persuade us we may lawfully do to created beings, our fellow-servants. But doth he not perceive, that this method of reasoning will excuse all the *saint* and *angel* worship, professed by the modern and superstitious members of the church of *Rome*, and hitherto so justly renounced by Protestants? For as oft as they are warmly attacked upon this article, their method is, to secure a retreat in the very distinction here advanced by the author, and as oft as confuted, still to insist upon it, that the incense they offer to created beings, ascends through them to the supreme God, and tends to the abundant increase of his honour and glory.

It is, I apprehend, with a retrospect view to this argument, that the author afterwards delivers his opinion, concerning that right  
I which



which God himself hath to the worship of his creatures; for the case is stated in such a manner, as seemingly to favour the possibility of a title to adoration in inferior beings. The sentiment is borrowed from Sir *Isaac Newton*, though I would hope that great man never intended to make so bad an use of it, and the whole remark is this — “ The worship which is due from man  
 “ to God, is on account of the *dominion* he  
 “ hath over him.—So that the Son be-  
 “ cometh our *God*, not so much on account  
 “ of his having been employed in the crea-  
 “ tion, and *that by him God created the*  
 “ *worlds*, as because all judgment is com-  
 “ mitted to him, this being the great *obli-*  
 “ *gation* of all duty<sup>d</sup>.”

But, to worship God as the *Creator* of the world, is also to worship him as the supreme ruler of it, for the act of creation, and the right of supremacy, are inseparable. *The earth is the LORD's*, saith the psalmist, *and the fulness thereof, the world, and they that dwell therein:* to which he immediately subjoins the reason, why the LORD hath this dominion over the world and all

X

its

its inhabitants—for (or *because*) *he hath founded it upon the seas, and establiſhed it upon the floods*<sup>e</sup>. Were it the *dominion* of God, in ſeverance from his power as Creator, which lays us under the obligation of worſhip, then St. *Paul*, when he condemned the idolatry of the *Gentiles*, ſhould have ſtated their crime thus—that they worſhipped what had *no dominion*, rather than *him which had*. But he expreſſes it otherways, and ſays, that they worſhipped the *creature*, rather than the *Creator*<sup>f</sup>, which plainly ſhews what it is that entitles God to the adoration of mankind; they are his creatures, and therefore they muſt adore him.

This principle of *dominion*, if it were reſted in, would excuſe all the abominable idolatry of the *Pagans*, who pay divine adoration to the natural rulers, the ſun, moon, ſtars, &c. which God hath appointed to *rule* over the day, and over the night, becauſe they deemed them to be the *Gods which GOVERN the world*<sup>g</sup>; and the conteſt between antient believers and unbelievers, always turned upon this point, whether

<sup>e</sup> Ps. xxiv. 1, 2.    <sup>f</sup> Rom. i. 25.    <sup>g</sup> *Wiſdom* xiii. 2.

ther these natural rulers were self-existent, and had power essential in themselves, or whether they derived it from a Creator, who being such, was therefore alone to be worshipped. But there is another capital error in this assertion; for, argues he, "the Son becometh *our God*, because *all judgment is committed unto him*." Now, as far as all judgment is *committed* to the Son, he is not *our God*; because, as far as all judgment is *committed* to him, he is man; for which reason St. Paul declared to his audience of philosophers at *Athens*, that God *will judge the world by that MAN* (*ἐν αὐτῷ*) *whom he hath ordained*<sup>b</sup>: and he is not *our God* by being *man* only, but by being *Emmanuel*, God *with us*, that is, God incarnate. As far as he is a person of the God-head, he hath judgment essentially in himself, for *vengeance is mine, I will repay*, saith JEHOVAH<sup>a</sup>. Wherefore, let us turn his arguments which way soever we will, and set them in what light we please, still, every way, nothing but the most complicated error is to be found in them; and, therefore, without pursuing them any

X 2

farther,

<sup>a</sup> Acts xvii. 31. <sup>b</sup> Rom. xii. 19. from Deut. xxxii. 35, 36.

farther, I may obviate them all at once, by subjoining the words of God himself, uttered by the prophet *Isaiab*, in relation to this very article. *Thus saith God the LORD, HE THAT CREATED the heavens, and stretched them out—I am JEHOVAH, that is my name, and my glory will I not GIVE TO ANOTHER, neither my praise to graven images<sup>k</sup>.* No person, but the one Creator, can have the glory of being called by the name Jehovah, or be entitled to any degree of that praise which is due thereupon: and he who is the supreme Creator of the universe, doth here declare, as full as words can express it, that he will not commission any being to receive divine adoration, since this is due only to himself—**THOU SHALT WORSHIP THE LORD THY GOD, AND HIM ONLY SHALT THOU SERVE<sup>l</sup>,**

<sup>k</sup> Isa. xlii. 5, 8.

<sup>l</sup> Matt. iv. 10.

**CHAP.**



## C H A P. V.

*Wherein, the extent and validity of his Conclusion is examined.*

**H**ERE we shall have the opportunity of seeing the opinion this gentleman entertains of the merits of his own performance, and the strength of his reasonings, how much his Conclusion amounts to, and how much, according to the plan, upon which he has proceeded, it ought to amount to. I shall first set down the whole, as it stands in his book, then divide it into particular articles, and make a separate reply to each of them. His Conclusion is this ;

“ I apprehend therefore, it is manifestly,  
 “ shewed in these papers, that, from the  
 “ consideration of the nature of spirit, by  
 “ the light of reason, it appears, there can  
 “ be but one God, that is, one supreme intelligent agent ; which one God may,  
 “ however, create an infinite series of spiritual agents, in subordination one to another ; some of which may, by an authority communicated to them from the  
 “ supreme God, act *as Gods*, with regard  
 “ to

“ to those inferior beings, who are com-  
 “ mitted to their charge. I apprehend it  
 “ likewise appears from the sentiments of  
 “ the *Jews*, as well as from the scriptures,  
 “ both of the Old and New-testament, that  
 “ this is the method of government, which  
 “ the Almighty hath been pleased to pursue  
 “ in the œconomy of this universe, still re-  
 “ serving to himself that incommunicable  
 “ quality of *supreme*, which it would be a  
 “ contradiction to suppose him divested of,  
 “ either with or without his will; that is,  
 “ either by his own consent, or by neces-  
 “ sity”.

### ARTICLE I.

“ I apprehend, therefore, it is manifestly  
 “ shewed in these papers, that, from the  
 “ consideration of the nature of spirit, by  
 “ the light of reason, it appears.” —

### ANSWER.

“ Nothing, concerning the spiritual or in-  
 “ visible world, can *really* appear by the light  
 “ of unassisted human reason; which being  
 “ *natural* itself, and having nothing but *na-*  
 “ *tural things* before it, hath no possible  
 “ means

means of obtaining any certain knowledge of *things spiritual*. Many things, indeed, may *seem* to appear (as the astronomer said, *videor mihi videre*) when, in truth, they are nothing but the abortive conceptions of a whimsical brain, and have no existence any where else in *rerum naturâ*. One speculative disquisitor may, out of a compliment to the supposed depth of his own imagination, regulate the spiritual world in this manner, and another in that; while, so long as revelation is out of the question, they can, when called upon, neither support their own system, nor confute that of another person.

For these reasons, therefore, and others before mentioned, it cannot be expected, that, from this topic of argumentation, any thing *real* or worth our notice should *appear* upon the important subject now in hand: and, indeed, to consider any doctrine by the light of nature and reason, when there is that of revelation ready at hand, and professedly giving its assistance, is every whit as imprudent and absurd, as for a man to reject day-light, and an open road to travel in, that he may shew his genius by taking

a solitary walk amongst bogs and pits in the dark, when it is ten to one but he tumbles headlong into the first that lies in his way.

## ARTICLE II.

“There can be but one God, that is,  
“but one supreme intelligent agent.”

### ANSWER.

None but heathens ever disputed it; was there any occasion then for rummaging the depths of reason, to prove what every Christian must unavoidably grant? or rather, doth he not mean to affirm, that he only, whom we call the *first person* of the Trinity, is the *supreme* God? But if the scripture gives the title of *supreme* to the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* likewise, as I have manifestly shewed that it does, something else must *appear*, which a proper degree of humility in the author would have inclined him to believe upon God's authority, and have saved him the fruitless labour (I wish it was nothing worse) of writing two hundred pages in order to disprove it.

## ARTICLE



ARTICLE III.

“ Which one God, however, may create  
 “ an infinite series of spiritual agents, in  
 “ subordination one to another.”

ANSWER.

True, God may do this; but unless this gentleman has proved, that *Christ* and the *Holy Ghost* are of this number, he has done nothing, but is still in *statu quo*, just where he was when he set out: why did he not say then, *it manifestly appears* that they are *creatures*? for whether it does or no, we are sure, it was his full intent that it should; and his premises, if they are sound and good, prove a great deal more than he hath deemed it proper here to set down in his conclusion.

ARTICLE IV.

“ Some of which (created spirits) may,  
 “ by an authority communicated to them,  
 “ from the supreme God, act *as Gods*,  
 “ with regard to those inferior beings, who  
 “ are committed into their charge.”

ANSWER.

It ought to have been—“ some of which, may be dignified with the incommunicable name *Jehovah*, declared to be *supreme*, and

Y

adored

adored as *Creators* of the universe; and yet after all, be in reality, not *Gods*, but *creatures*." As for their being a kind of *quasi-dei*, assuming to themselves the honour of self-existence, and suffering divine worship to be paid to them, only because they were *sent in the name of God*, it is absurd and impossible; for a vicegerent or ambassador is never honoured with the title of the monarch he represents, or admitted to sit as his equal upon the throne with him<sup>a</sup>.

## ARTICLE V.

" I apprehend it, likewise, appears from  
 " the sentiments of the *Jews*, as well as  
 " from the scriptures, both of the Old and  
 " New-testament, that this is the method  
 " of government the Almighty hath been  
 " pleased to pursue, in the œconomy of  
 " this universe."

## ANSWER.

<sup>a</sup> Nefas est cogitare, histrioniam aliquando exercuisse angelos, et deum incommunicabile nomen ipsis communicasse, aut talem representationem, in quâ creaturâ omnia, quæ Dei sunt, sibi attribuat. Recte etiam doctissimus Camero: sane, inquit, *patroni clientum personas sæpe induunt; at ne fando quidem unquam auditum est, ullum legatum, cum principis sui mandata proponit, aliter loqui quam in tertiâ personâ: princeps meus hæc dicit. Cujus rei illustre testimonium habemus apud prophetas, apud quos nimirum solennis formula est, Dicit dominus, &c. Defensio Fid. Necæn. Sect. 1. Cap. 1. § 11.*

## ANSWER.

As for the modern *Jews*, I have shewed that they are not qualified to give their evidence in relation to this or any other point of *Christian* doctrine; and the author himself hath entered a disqualification against them, without fairly offering to reverse it. As for the *method of government*, or angelic system of politics here alluded to, if the reader thinks it worth his while to turn back to the page in which I have summed up the evidence, alledged in support of it, I dare be answerable for his *apprehending* no such thing.

## ARTICLE VI.

“ Still reserving to himself that incommunicable quality of *supreme*, which it  
 “ would be a contradiction to suppose him  
 “ divested of, &c.”

## ANSWER.

True, it would be a *contradiction* for the *supreme* to be divested of this his incommunicable quality; but this is nothing to the purpose: for the question still remains untouched, which is, whether the second and third persons of the Trinity, as subsisting in

the unity of the supreme essence, and partaking of this incommunicable quality, must thereby divest the Father of it?

Such is this mighty conclusion, to which the gentle reader is led through so many dark and intricate windings; and which by the author of it is thought sufficient to overturn the Liturgy, demolish the Creeds, and make the Bishops and Clergy, which have in faith and truth subscribed to the *Book of Common Prayer*, ashamed of themselves!

---

## C H A P. VI.

*His enquiry into the sentiments of the Primitive Fathers of the Christian church considered.*

OUR author, having thus summed up his doctrine in brief, as he apprehends it manifestly to appear from his premises, is pleased to assure us, in the next place, that “ if we consult the opinions of  
“ the Fathers upon this subject, for the first  
“ three hundred years after Christ, we shall  
“ find them all universally agreeing in the  
“ afore-



“ afore-mentioned doctrine: as may appear  
 “ by consulting *Justin Martyr, Athenagoras,*  
 “ *Tatian, Irenæus, the Author of the Re-*  
 “ *cognitions, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandri-*  
 “ *nus, Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dio-*  
 “ *nysius of Alexandria, Lactantius, &c.*”

The afore-mentioned doctrine, which we are to find them all universally agreeing in, is, that the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* are neither of them really God, but act only as Gods, and yet are to receive divine adoration from inferior beings. Well; but where are his proofs? they come next, to be sure, because something is to appear, upon consulting the *Fathers*. No; quite another matter: the thing, it seems, is so clear, that “ it is *needleless* to produce any quotations out “ of them, as this point is plainly given up “ by three of the most learned persons of “ the last age, which are, the judicious “ Mr. *Chillingworth*, the learned Bp. *Bull*, “ and the discerning Dr. *Cudworth* <sup>p</sup>.”

How the case really stands with these three divines, shall be considered, after I have laid before the reader a much more powerful reason for that pretended *needleless-*  
*ness,*

ness, by which this gentleman would excuse himself from the trouble of quoting ; which is, that all the Fathers he has mentioned, (one only excepted) are universally against his afore-mentioned doctrine. But as the extracts I should make from them, would, if set down in their several originals, be calculated only for the satisfaction of the learned, who may as well turn to the books themselves, I may be excused from increasing the bulk of these papers by giving them at length, and shall therefore only refer to the places at the bottom of the page <sup>1</sup>.

And, not to leave my *English* reader quite in the dark, I shall beg leave here to offer one argument, which of itself is sufficient to shew, that all the most early members

<sup>1</sup> *Just. Mart.* ad Diogn. Epist. Ed. Par. p. 501. *ὅτι οὐ αἱ,* &c. Resp. ad Orthod. p. 295. *ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ,* &c. — *Athenag.* p. 10. *ibid.* ἀλλ' εἰς οὐκ ἓν, &c. — *Tatian.* Orat. cont. Græc. p. 145. *ibid.* — *Irenæus.* adv. Hæres. lib. 4. c. 11. *Dominus enim noster,* &c. and lib. 3. c. 8. *ipse enim in se Æus,* &c. — *Author of the Apost. Const.* lib. 7. c. 42. *Καὶ οὗς Κυρίως Ἰησοῦ,* &c. — *Tertull.* adv. Prax. c. 3. Numerum & dispositionem Trinitatis, &c. — *Clem. Alexand.* Admon. ad Gen. p. 5. and 6. *Νῦν δὲ,* &c. *Pædag.* l. 1. c. 8. p. 113. — *Origen contr. Cels.* lib. 6. p. 287. *ὅτι γὰρ τὸν ἀγνῶστον,* &c. and *περὶ ἀρχῶν,* as cited in *Jerom.* tom. 9. p. 121. Nunquam utique in Unitate Trinitatis, &c. — *Greg. Thaum.* Ed. Par. p. 1. *Τριὰς τι- λία,* &c. — For the opinion of *Dionysius of Alexandria,* see *Albanasius,* tom. 1. p. 559, &c.

bers of the *Christian* church, were universally against *his doctrine*; and such an argument it is, as both the learned and unlearned must immediately perceive the force of.

*Lucian*, who lived as early as the days of *Adrian* (that is, about the beginning of the second century, two hundred years before the council of *Nice*) and was initiated into the Christian faith, but afterwards apostatized to Paganism, in one of his dialogues, wherein the interlocutors make it their business to scoff at the Christian religion, puts the following speech into one of their mouths — Ὑψιμερόντα Θεόν, μέγαν, αἰθέροτον, ὑρα-  
νίωνα, υἱὸν Πατρὸς, Πνεῦμα ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐκπο-  
ρευόμενον, ἐν ἐκ τριῶν, καὶ ἐξ ἐνὸς τρία. ταῦτα  
νομίζε Ζήνα, τὸν δὲ πῦρ Θεόν. *The almighty  
God, great, immortal, and celestial, the Son  
of the Father, the Spirit proceeding from  
the Father, ONE of THREE, and THREE of  
ONE: THESE you must suppose to be Jove,  
THIS you must esteem as God. To which  
another makes answer, by way of ridicule*  
— οὐκ οἶδα γὰρ τι λέγεις· ἐν τρία, καὶ τρία ἐν ᾧ.  
*I don't understand what you mean: one is  
three, and three are one!*

This

This of *Lucian*, though it is but a jeer, yet it is so strongly expressed, as to afford us a direct proof, that the doctrine of the Trinity in perfect Unity, that is, constituting together the one supreme God, was in his time professedly subsisting in the church; for it is not any one particular writer, or two, or three, but the whole body of *Christians*, he here aims at. And therefore, it appears as manifestly, that the doctrine of the Trinity, according to our present sense of it, was then universally professed by the *Christians*, as it does from another expression of the same *Lucian*, that they then universally maintained the *resurrection of the dead*: for he derides them all, as a set of poor senseless wretches (*κακοδαιμονες*, *poor devils*) who deluded themselves with the vain hopes of being made immortal<sup>a</sup>.

As for Mr. *Chillingworth*, the author favours us with a posthumous letter of his, given in his life, as written by *Des Maiseaux*, p. 51. which is an answer to a friend, who desired to know what judgment might be made of *Arianism*, from the sense of antiquity. If this letter is genuine,

<sup>a</sup> Πεινικασι γαρ αυτες οι κακοδαιμονες, το μιν ο λον αθανατοι ισισθαι. De Mort. Peregr.



nuine, I am sorry for it: but, at the same time, am not in the least influenced by the authority of a great name, where I may with modesty think, that I have a right to judge for myself. And therefore, I must take the liberty to assert, that Mr. *Chillingworth* hath grossly misrepresented the sense of antiquity, at the beginning of his letter; and given, not only an unfair, but an injudicious state of the case, at the end of it; which, in so great and celebrated a writer, is what I cannot account for. He tells his friend, that “even in *Athanasius* himself, “the greatest adversary of the (*Arian*) “doctrine, he may find, that the eighty “Fathers, which condemned *Samosatenus*, “affirmed expressly—that the Son is not of “the same essence with the Father. Which “is to contradict formally the council of “*Nice*, which decreed the Son co-essential “with the Father.” To each of these sentences, I am obliged to set down an express contradiction: for the eighty Fathers, which condemned *Paul of Samosata*, did not deny that the Son was of the same essence of the Father; neither did they formally contradict the council of *Nice*. This crafty fellow,

Z

low, *Paul*, made a wicked use of the word *homoousios*, and by it endeavoured to run the orthodox upon the contradiction of three *ousias*, or essences in the Trinity<sup>t</sup>: so that when it is said of these eighty prelates, that they rejected the term *homoousios*, *consubstantial*, we are to understand nothing more, than that they rejected it, because *Samosatenus* had abused and perverted it; since it is plain, that, in other words, they retained that very sense of the Trinity, which by the decree of the *Nicene* council, this term was intended to convey. For in their second synodical epistle, written in regard to this arch-heretic, we find the following words—*Qui autem dicit, confiteri filium Dei esse Deum, non esse aliud quam Duos Deos prædicare, hunc alienum esse ab ecclesiasticâ regula arbitramur*<sup>u</sup>. *Whosoever shall say, that to confess the Son of God to be very God, is the same with preaching up two distinct Gods, (as the said Paul did affirm) such an one we esteem to have departed from the established doctrine of the church.* Now to affirm, as they here do, that the Father and the Son are not *two Gods*, is to affirm that they are *one*.

<sup>t</sup> *Dionysii Alex. Epist. in Athanas. v. I. p. 919.*

<sup>u</sup> Cited by *Petavius*, *Præf. ad Lib. de Trin. ch. 2. §. 1.*

*one.* But this unity must be either an unity of essence, or an unity of person : an unity of person it cannot be ; therefore it is an unity of essence. And pray, what is this, but the very sense of *homoousios* ? wherefore, Mr. *Chillingworth* (if the letter be really his) hath certainly misrepresented these Fathers ; and it is manifest, that they, and the Bishops of the *Nicene* council, were of one and the same opinion ; though, as occasion required, they may have expressed themselves differently.

But in the conclusion of this letter, he in a manner leaves the *Arians* in possession of the field ; and that for the following reason. “ Whosoever, says he, shall freely  
 “ and impartially consider of this thing, and  
 “ how, on the other side, the ancient Fathers weapons against the *Arians* are in a  
 “ manner only places of scripture, and those  
 “ now for the most part discarded as impertinent and unconcluding—he shall not  
 “ chuse but confess, or at least be very inclinable to believe, that the doctrine of  
 “ *Arius* is either a truth, or at least no  
 “ damnable heresy.”



And what *weapons* would Mr. *Chillingworth* have had them use? There can be none so proper, as *the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God*. It was the very weapon *Christ* himself made use of against the devil: and though the *Arians* have, in all ages, done their utmost to turn the edge of it, it is still sharp enough to cut in pieces all the subtilties and stratagems of *satan*; and theirs amongst the rest. I cannot, therefore, be so free and impartial, as to conclude with myself, that the doctrine of *Arius* was no damnable heresy, purely because the weapons of the Fathers against his followers, were in a manner *only* places of scripture. Whether they are, as he calls them, *impertinent* and *unconcluding*, is another question; with which, as this learned man hath not been pleased to mention any of them, we have at present no concern.

We next proceed to Dr. *Cudworth*: and as for him, the *author* tells us, that “ he does not only give up the Primitive Fathers in their expressions, but also in their meaning.” Of which, and of the quotation made from the said *doctor*, I shall take



take no farther notice, than just to subjoin a little short hint, from a scarce and incomparable work of the learned Dr. *Turner* upon mythology, in which we meet with the following stricture upon the *discerning* Dr. *Cudworth*——“ But I wonder how it came  
 “ to pass, that the learned writer of the  
 “ Intellectual System, who seems at every  
 “ turn to be so extravagantly fond of a Tri-  
 “ nity (notwithstanding, as I have proved  
 “ elsewhere, he hath made it his business  
 “ to undermine and overthrow it) should  
 “ be able to make it out so fully, that the  
 “ *Greeks* and *Romans* had a Trinity, though  
 “ *he himself* hath none \*.”

The third divine, who has *plainly given up this point*, and allowed that *Arianism* hath the testimony of all the ancient Fathers, is Bishop *Bull* : and the strange fate of this great man, who will for ever deserve the praise of the Christian church, for his most learned and pious defence of its faith, cannot sufficiently be wondered at. It is but a few years since he was, by the learned Mr. *Warburton*, dragged into a defence of  
 the

\* *Notes on Mythol.*—— I cannot refer to the page, because this book was designed only as a preface to a larger work, and is unpagged.

the *Divine Legation*, and made to affirm (as the new scheme of that ingenious gentleman required) that the doctrine of a future state was not to be found in the law of *Moses*. And here he is again as unhappily introduced by this writer, and falsely represented as giving up the sense of antiquity to the cause of *Arianism*; when in truth, he hath written set pieces, contrary to, and destructive of, the schemes advanced and defended by both these gentlemen. In one, he hath evidently shewed, that *everlasting life was the hope of all good men under the law*: in another, he hath reconciled the Fathers of the three first centuries with the *Nicene* faith; and undertook this glorious work, because it was the vain boast of the *Arian* party (as still it is, for they are never to be silenced) that the most ancient Fathers of the church were the original advocates and propagaters of their heresy.

From this very work it is, that the author extracts a passage, wherein it is confessed, that “ almost all the Fathers, who  
“ lived before the council of *Nice*, in their  
“ manner of explaining the article of the  
“ sacred

See his *Sermon* upon Ps. ciii. 15, 16.

“ sacred Trinity, sometimes speak other-  
 “ wise, than the *Catholics* do.” But this  
 concession can be of no advantage to an  
*Arian*; because it hath been the attempt of  
 this most learned man to prove, by a com-  
 plete induction of particulars, that although  
 the *Ante-Nicene* and *Catholic* Fathers do  
 sometimes differ in *expression*, yet they differ  
 not in *sentiment*. And the man that is so  
 ignorant as not to know, either that this  
 was his attempt, or that he hath well suc-  
 ceeded in it, can have no right to mention  
 the name of that illustrious prelate; whose  
 memory will ever be dear to those that re-  
 gard the inestimable truths of the Christian  
 faith, and reverence such as profess them,  
 according to the direction of our blessed  
 Master, in innocence of life, and sanctity  
 of manners. The man that *does* know this,  
 and yet can represent him as giving up a  
 point within the space of three lines, which  
 through the compass of almost three hun-  
 dred pages he hath endeavoured to carry,  
 must be of the *mendacissimum genus homi-*  
*num*; a character, which the aforesaid Bi-  
 shop, for their notorious and repeated for-  
 geries,

2 *Eff.* p. 119, 120. *Def. Fid. Nic.* Sect. 11. c. 9. §. 22.

geries, thought proper to bestow upon the  
*Arians*.

Before we finish upon this head, it will not be amiss to recollect, that the *author* in his title-page promised an *inquiry into the sentiments of the Primitive Fathers of the church*. And what does he think an *inquiry* to be? Is it something, in which a man never *inquires* at all? for instead of turning to any pertinent expressions in the writings of the Fathers, and obliging his readers with a fair and regular disquisition of them, he rather chuses to borrow a second-hand opinion from those, who for different reasons have turned to them, and made different reports concerning them: having done this, he treats us with an imperfect account of their answers. One says, that the doctrine of *Arius* is no damnable heresy, because the weapons of the Fathers, on the contrary side, were *nothing but places of scripture*—another, that he discards even the very *meaning* of the Primitive Fathers—and a third, has written a *folio*, to prove the very contrary to what he would make him affirm. And this he is pleased to call (by way of banter to be sure) an *inquiry*  
into



into the sentiments of the Primitive Fathers; when, as far as they are concerned, he seems only just to have *inquired* what their *names* were, and then makes a rattle with *Athenagoras, Gregory Thaumaturgus, &c.*

## CH A P. VII.

*His misapplication of the Heathen Trinities.*

**T**HIS part of his work is entitled, an *inquiry* into the doctrine of the Trinity, as maintained by the *Egyptians, Pythagoreans, and Platonists*. His design in making this inquiry, is to point out a subordination of power in the persons of the *Trinity*; that this doctrine, as maintained by the Heathens before the coming of Christ, may confirm his own notion of the *sacred Trinity*. And he is pleased to conjecture, or rather to affirm for truth, that the reason why the *Platonists, &c.* were so ready to embrace the *Christian* religion, was, the close resemblance between the *Pagan Trinity* in general, or the *Platonic* in particular,

A a

and

and the Trinity as maintained in its pure and genuine sense (with a professed subordination of power in it) by the Primitive *Christians*<sup>a</sup>. All of which is *gratis dictum*: for in the first place, it is clear, that the Primitive *Christians*, where they write like themselves, do not allow a subordination of power; and in this he mistakes the *Arians* for the *Christians*, since it is the original *Arian* Trinity, and not the *Christian*<sup>b</sup>, that supposes such an inferiority in the persons of the Godhead. It is likewise clear, that the resemblance between the *Platonic* and the *Christian* Trinity, as sometimes loosely commented upon by the early writers of the church, be it more or less, did not proceed from any natural affinity between them, but from that strange leaven of false philosophy, with which several of the Fathers corrupted the purity of the *Christian* system.

But, to come nearer to the point, we must insist upon it, that our author should *inquire*, what the Pagans originally *meant* by their Trinities, and endeavour to explain, before he applies; for to *inquire after* them, and *inquire into* them, are two very different

<sup>a</sup> P. 122, 123.

*Athan.* Ep. ad Afr. Episc,

<sup>b</sup> Μαλλον Αρειανοι ἢ Χριστιανοι,

rent things: the former any body may do; the latter is attended with some labour and difficulty. And unless he can be sure, that the *Pagans*, when they profess a *Trinity*, mean the very same with that of the Old and New Testament, they cannot be permitted to have any share in the controversy.

The inquiry is opened with the *Egyptian Trinity*, as delivered by *Jamblichus*; and yet the gentleman, agreeable to his usual intricacy, does not attempt to give any satisfactory reasons for producing it, but confesses that he cannot translate it. It is *abstruse, dark, and super-intelligible*; and he leaves the translation of it to the “*deistical admirers*” of the religion of nature<sup>d</sup>.

A mighty odd way this: first to put the *Heathen Trinity* upon a level with the *Christian*, then draw it up in battle-array, and sound a trumpet before it, as if it were capable of great achievements against the doctrine he is at war with; and then, on a sudden, to turn short, and ridicule its con-

A a 2                      temptible

<sup>c</sup> P. 125.

<sup>d</sup> The principles of which religion are so much admired by the author himself, that he has received them as the most effectual test of the scriptural Trinity. For the beginning of his title-page runs thus—*An Essay on Spirit, in which the doctrine of the Trinity is considered in the light of NATURE and REASON.*

temptible obscurity ! This *Egyptian* Trinity I shall transcribe, as the *author* gives it<sup>c</sup>; and, with humble submission, try my hand at a literal *English* translation of it: and and though it is one of the dark recesses of Paganism, which cannot be properly searched into without much diligence and attention, more than at present I have either leisure or inclination to bestow upon it, yet I shall beg leave to offer, as they occur to me, a few hints toward an explanation of it, and readily submit them to better judgments for improvement and correction.

Προ τῶν οὐρανῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ τῶν ὅλων ἀρχῶν  
 ἐστὶ Θεὸς εἷς, πρῶτος καὶ τὸ πρῶτον Θεὸς καὶ  
 βασιλεὺς, ἀκινήτος ἐν μονοτητί τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἐν-  
 τητός μενῶν, ὅτε γὰρ νοήσον αὐτῷ ἐπιπλε-  
 ται, ὅτε ἄλλο τι. Παράδειγμα δὲ ἰδρύται τὸ  
 αὐτὸ πατὴρ, αὐτογενὴς, καὶ μονοπατορ  
 Θεὸς, τὸ οὐρανὸς ἀρχαῖς. Μείζων γὰρ τι καὶ πρῶ-  
 τος, καὶ πηγὴ τῶν πάντων, καὶ πύρην τῶν  
 νοουμένων πρῶτων εἰδῶν οὐτῶν. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς  
 ἐνότητος, ὁ αὐτάρχης Θεὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐξελαμψε  
 διὸ καὶ αὐτοπατὴρ, καὶ αὐτάρχης. Ἀρχὴ γὰρ  
 αὐτοῦ καὶ Θεὸς Θεῶν. Μονὰς ἐκ τῆς ἐνότητος, περ

υσίας,



υπας, και αρχη της υπας· απ' αυτης γαρ η υπας  
της και η υπα· διο γαρ νοηταρχης προπαγορευε-  
ται. Αυται μεν εν ειναι αρχαι πρεσβυταται  
παντων, ας Ερμης περ των αιδερων και εμ-  
πειρων θεων περπατει, και των επεραντων.

“ Before all things which really ARE,  
“ and before the beginning of all beings,  
“ there is one God, prior to the first God  
“ and king, remaining immoveable in the  
“ solitude of his unity ; for neither intel-  
“ lectuality, nor any thing else, is inter-  
“ mixt with him. He is the exemplar of  
“ himself the Father, the self-begotten God,  
“ the only Father, and the truly-good. For  
“ he is the greatest and the first, the foun-  
“ tain of all things, and the root of all pri-  
“ mary existent forms. But from this one,  
“ the self-sufficient God shone himself out ;  
“ for which reason, he is self-generated and  
“ self-sufficient ; for he is the beginning,  
“ and the God of Gods : he is unity pro-  
“ duced from one ; he is before all essence,  
“ and is himself the beginning of essence ;  
“ because, from him are entity and essence :  
“ wherefore he is called the prince of in-  
“ telligence. These, therefore, are the most  
ancient

“ ancient principles of all things, under  
 “ which, in the third and inferior class,  
 “ *Hermes* ranks the etherial, empyreal, and  
 “ celestial deities.”

This, to be sure, if I have been a faithful interpreter, is most infernal jargon: but if the *Egyptian* sages, who drew it up, intended there should be any sense in it, we shall not be likely to discover this sense, by coming prepossessed with *christian* (or, in effect, *unchristian*) prejudices, and vainly imagining that Heathens, who *knew not God*, must have been prepossessed with the same notions: for it is a plain and serviceable rule in interpreting any author, not to bring his sense to him, and father an intention upon him which he never dreamt of; but to take it from his own words, and support it by a comparison with the sentiments of those that professed the same doctrines.

- It will also be allowed as indisputable, that the Heathens themselves best knew what was intended by their own *super-intelligible* mysteries: for which reason, I dare not attempt the short inquiry I have proposed, without taking *Macrobius*, who, as

far as I am able to judge, was the most learned of them all, for my guide and director; and then, though the mist is very thick, I have courage enough to hope, that we shall not quite be lost in it. He tells us, that if we would understand the Heathen theology, we must take with us the following admonition—*Cave æstimes, mi Aviene, poetarum gregem cum de diis fabulantur, non ab adytis plerunque philosophiæ semina mutuari* <sup>f</sup>. “When the poets relate their mysterious fables about the gods, take it generally for granted, that the subject-matter of these mysteries is borrowed from the depths of natural philosophy.” This rule *Macrobius* hath made an excellent use of, in unfolding the mysteries of the *Egyptians*, *Pythagoreans*, and *Platonists*; and if it holds good, it must put us upon searching, not for a spiritual or intellectual, but for a physical Trinity, in that precious stuff I have just now translated.

In pursuance therefore of this plan, we will lay it down, that the first God herein mentioned, is the *chaos* or *first matter*; that the second is *light*, or the *sun*; and the third

<sup>f</sup> *Saturn. lib. 1. c. 17.*



third the *soul of the world*, or vivifying spirit diffused from the sun through the whole system of beings, from the stars and planets, down to men, animals, and plants; and I must beg the reader candidly to suspend his judgment till I have run through the whole.

To proceed then,

*Before all things which really are, and before the beginning of all beings, there is one God, prior to the first God and King.*

This, as I have already observed, is the *chaos* or *first matter*, as it subsisted in a boundless uncreated mass from all eternity, till the *melior natura*<sup>s</sup>, its own intellectual efficacy, brought it into order; or as *Sanchoiatho* expresses it, till the *dark air of the chaos fell in love with its own principles*, and caused that mixture, from which all the Gods were generated<sup>h</sup>. This same deity, made of right superintelligible, is sometimes called *incomprehensible darkness*, as by *Damascius*—*Μία των όλων αρχή σκοτεινῆς ἀγνώστου*<sup>i</sup>,  
*The only principle of all things, is incomprehensible*

<sup>s</sup> Ovid Met. lib. 1. l. 17.

<sup>h</sup> Ἡραδὴ το σπινυμα των ιδιω αρχων, και γνωστο συγκερασσι, &c. Euseb. Præp. Evan. Lib. 1. Chap. 10.

<sup>i</sup> All I mention of *Damascius*, is taken from a manuscript fragment, referred to by the learned Bishop Cumberland in his remarks upon the hist. of *Sanchoiatho*. See page 280, &c.



*prehensible darkness*; and the *Babylonians*, as the same writer informs us, while they expressed divine worship to the other Gods, adored this first and super-existent God, by *passing him over in silence*<sup>k</sup>. In the *Orphic hymns*, *Night* is said to be *the begetter of Gods and men*<sup>l</sup>; and at other times the Heathens made a perfect *merry Andrew* of this dark deity, the material *chaos*, and called him *Proteus*, which according to the origination of his name (*Πρωτεύς*) is the *first God*, or *first matter*, which originally subsisted under no form, but was capable of assuming any, according to the infinitely various modifications of matter; and hence the poets, agreeable to their custom of borrowing from the *adyta philosophiæ*, tell us so much of his tricks and transformations. That this *Proteus*, or the *first matter* of the *chaos*, is the very same with that Deity, which is here nonsensically styled *the one God*, prior to the *first God and King*, must I apprehend, be evident from a fragment of *Epicharmus*, the most ancient of all the comic poets, wherein it is affirmed that the

B b

*Chaos*

<sup>k</sup> Μίαν τῶν ὅλων ἀρχὴν σιγῇ παρῆναι. See also *Plato* de Rep. l. 6. p. 686.

<sup>l</sup> Νύκτα θένον γένεσθαι ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀνδρῶν.

*Chaos* is the *first* of all the Gods—Χαο-  
ΠΡΩΤΟΣ των Θεων; nor is it possible there  
should be any sense in the phrase of, a πρω-  
τος το πρωτον, a *prior primo*, a God *before*  
*the first*; unless by the first πρωτος, we un-  
derstand, the self-existent matter of the *cha-*  
*os*; by the second the *light* or *sun*, the first  
and greatest ruler of the world, who was  
formed out of it.

It is farther said of him, that he “*re-*  
“*mains immoveable in the solitude of his*  
“*unity.*” He filled the boundless extent  
of space<sup>m</sup>, had no room left to move into,  
and therefore was in a motionless state of  
universal stability, since it was impossible  
that he should change places with himself.  
But he is in another sense more properly  
esteemed as *immoveable unity*, that is, be-  
cause out of this first matter all formed sub-  
stances are derived; and while they (the  
forms) undergo the perpetual vicissitudes of  
generation and corruption (or dissolution)  
that first matter out of which they are fra-  
med,

<sup>m</sup> Thus *Sancheoniathe* affirms, that the dark air, and tur-  
bid matter of the *chaos*, was for a long time infinite, and had  
no bounds.—ταυτα δὲ εἶναι ἀπειρα καὶ δια πολλὴν αἰωνα μὴ  
ἔχειν πέρας. *Ibid.*

med, still keeps steady to its principles, and remains unalterable.

*Omnia mortali mutantur lege Creatæ  
At manet incolumis MUNDUS suaque omnia  
servat ;*

*Quæ nec longa dies auget, minuitve senec-  
tus :*

*Nec motus puncto currit, cursusque fatigat.*

*IDEM semper erit, quoniam semper fuit*

*IDEM ;*

*Non alium videre patres, aliumve minores*

*Aspicient ; DEUS est, qui non mutatur in  
ævum.*

Manil. Astron. l. i. v. 515.

The unity, immutability, and divinity of this first matter, is a point of very high antiquity ; for it was a principle of *Linus*, that *of the one whole is all things, and that all things constitute the one whole*<sup>a</sup>, which is the first and incomprehensible God : and *Dio- genes Laertius* affirms the same of *Musæus*, who maintained, like all the rest, that *all things are made of ONE* (the homogeneous and eternal matter of the universe) *and that*

B b 2

into

<sup>a</sup> *Ex τῷ ὅλῳ δι τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἐκ πάντων τὸ πᾶν ἔστι.* Stob. Eclog. Physic.

into this ONE, they are again all resolved\*. And thus also *Plato*, describing the universe, as consisting of first matter, diversified into all the visible species, says, that the WHOLE is ONE and MANY P.

It is added moreover, that *neither intellectuality, nor any thing else is intermixt with him: that he is the exemplar of himself the Father, the self-begotten God, the only Father, and the truly good.*" From all of which, I can understand nothing more, than that matter was self-originated from all eternity without a Creator: whatever else may be intended by it, is abundantly too deep for my capacity. But when it is said, that "*he is the greatest and the first, the FOUNTAIN of all things, and the ROOT of all primary existent FORMS;*" here, I presume, we have a clear proof, that this first God is nothing more than the formless and universal mass of matter, out of which the forms are derived, as from their fountain, and

\* Εξ ἑνὸς τὰ πάντα γινέσθαι, καὶ εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ἀναλυσθαι. Diog. Laer. in procem. S. 3. This capital article of the Egyptian physico-theology was expressed hieroglyphically by the figure of a serpent, in an orbicular posture, with its tail in its mouth; by which, as *Pierius* observes, they meant to signify, *mundum ex seipso ali, et in se revolvi.* Hierogl. l. 14. p. 102. Ε. Πᾶς ἑστὶ καὶ πολλὰ. Plat. in Parmen.



and from whence they shoot forth, as the stem, branches, and leaves of a tree do from its ROOT. In which very manner, *Jupiter*, as understood to be the one universal God, comprehending all other deities comprehensible and incomprehensible in himself, is described by *Orpheus*,

Ζεὺς πρῶτος γενέτο, Ζεὺς ὑστατος ἀρχαρχαυτος,  
 Ζεὺς κεφαλῇ, Ζεὺς μεσση, Διὸς δὲκ παντὶς  
 πτοκται,  
 Ζεὺς ΠΥΘΜΗΝ γαίης, π καὶ οὐραῖς ἀστέρων  
 ἐντος, Arist. de mundo.

*Jupiter is the first and the last, the head, and the midst; OUT OF him all things are fabricated: he is the ROOT of earth, and of the starry heaven.* By which it is meant, as I humbly conjecture, that he is the *first*, as having existed in a dark and incomprehensible state, prior to that of the *forms*; the *middle*, as subsisting *under* the forms; and the *last*, as resolved, in the continued round of generation and corruption, into his own first principles again. Much more might be said of this dark first cause; but we will pass on to the second person of this Trinity,

whose origin from the first is set forth in the following terms. *But from this ONE, the self-sufficient God shone himself out; for which reason, he is self-generated and self-sufficient.*" The light, which is the second God here spoken of, did, according to the Heathen creed, extricate itself by its own power from the bands of original darkness, and arose from the confused mass of earthy, airy, and watry matter. For it is affirmed by *Hesiod* in his *theogony*, that *Chaos*, the first incomprehensible darkness, begat *Night and Erebus*; that is, the *chaos* turned itself into a male and female power, a sort of *hermaphrodite*, and then begat *æther* or *day-light*; who is elsewhere called *Epos*; *Love* or *Cupid*, which sprang forth with golden wings from the *chaos*, and hatched it. The *Egyptians* worshipped this same God, under the name of *Cnephs*, and asserted him to be *without beginning*

ἦλος μὲν ΠΡΩΤΙΣΤΑ ΧΑΟΣ γένετ' —

Ἐκ Χαιῶ δ' Ἐριῶς τε μελαινα τε Νυξ γυγνούσῃ,

Νυκτὶ δ' αὐτ' Αἰθήρ τε καὶ Ἥμερη ἐξηγενούσῃ,

Οὗς τέκε κροσσόμην, Ἐρίβην φιλοπύην μιν γίγνισα.

Theog. l. 116, &c.

Which is the *Hebrew* word כנפ CaNePH, a *wing*; and by this name, they meant to intimate the swiftness of the *light* in its progress from the sun, and accordingly they made images of this God, painted of different colours, and winged. See *Macrob. Saturn. Lib. 1. Ch. 19.*

*beginning and without end*<sup>a</sup>; and yet *Damascius* confesses that *Asclepiades* makes his *Egyptian Cneph* or *Cnephis*, to be begotten out of *sand and water*, the muddy mixture of the *chaos*; from which it must be altogether clear, that this God, though without beginning and without end, could yet be no *spiritual principle*<sup>b</sup>; and if not a spiritual, then a *natural or physical principle*, which is the very thing I am contending for.

“ *He is the beginning, and the God of “ Gods”* ] which *Cicero* expresses, by calling the *sun*, the—*dux et moderator luminum reliquorum*”. “ *Unity produced from one: “ he was before all essence, and is himself “ the beginning of essence; for from him are “ entity and essence.”* ] What the *EN* or *ONE* is, we have seen already; as for this *μονας* or *unity* which arose from him, *Macrobius* says of it (just as it was said of *Cneph*) that it is *without beginning and without end*. He also affirms, that it is the *mind begotten of the first cause*; which *mind*, as we learn from another part of his writings, was nothing else but the *sun*<sup>w</sup>. And this is still farther confirmed,

<sup>a</sup> *Plut. de Is. and Osir.*    <sup>b</sup> See *Cumberland's Remarks*, p. 13, p. 281.    <sup>w</sup> *Somn. Scip.*    <sup>v</sup> In *Somn. Scip. Lib. 1, Cap. 6. Cap. 20.*



confirmed, because the *Affyrians* adored the *sun*, under the very name of *unity*; they called him *Adad*, which is plainly a corruption of the *Hebrew* אַחַד ACHAD, and *Macrobius* so explains it; for, says he, *eius nominis interpretatio, est UNUS*<sup>x</sup>.

How he could be *before all essence* and be himself the *beginning of essence*, may, I think, be understood by the help of an ancient *Scholion* upon a verse of *Hesiod*, which supplies us with a very clear distinction between *first matter* and *essence*; according to which, *υλη* *first matter*, is to be considered as an unwrought mass of metal; *εσσα* *essence*, as the same mass hammered into form and figure<sup>y</sup>. Therefore, the *sun*, as his substance from all eternity made a part of the formless *chaos*, was *before essence*; as receiving a form and figure, upon his self-generation from it, he is the *first essence*, properly so called. The reason why it is added, that *from him are entity and essence*, is plainly this; the Heathens esteemed the light or power of the sun, to be the sole efficient cause in the formation of all the substances

<sup>x</sup> Sat. lib. 1. c. 23.

<sup>y</sup> Ὡς ἡ μὲν ἔστιν ὁ χαλκός, ὥσα δὲ ἡ διαίθεσις τοῦ χαλκοῦ. See *Dan. Heinsius's* Edit. p. 239. b.



substances in nature: the matter of them they supposed to have been as eternal as himself; but their growth, form, and figure, proceed entirely from his agency, and the *essence* of any thing (as we have already seen) is constituted by its figuration. As intelligence likewise, according to their philosophy, arises from the form or structure of any particular body, and as this structure is owing to the operation of the sun's power, therefore he is (as also for other reasons\*) dignified with the attribute of *νοῦταρχος* the "*prince of intelligence.*"—

Thus much for the first and second persons of this *Egyptian* Trinity: as for the third degree of power, it is supported by the whole tribe of *etherial*, *empyrean*, and *celestial* Gods, amounting to nothing more than the *dæmons* or divine minds, which animate the stars and planets, and people the wide extent of the airy regions; that is, in short, the intelligent *æther* itself, expanded from the sun's orb, to the extremities of the system.

As *Egypt* was the grand academy of Paganism, and the other Trinities, the *Pythagorean*,

C c

gorean,

\* See what I cited at p. 73. from the book *De Diata.*

gorean, and Platonic, were in all probability borrowed from that we have already considered, it should seem needless to take any particular notice of them; but as it is in some degree necessary to trace this similitude, I shall spend a few words upon each of them.

The first of the two, is given by *Simplicius* in his comment upon *Aristotle*, out of *Moderatus* the *Pythagorean*, and stands thus<sup>a</sup>. Το μὲν πρῶτον ἐν ὑπὲρ τὸν καὶ πᾶσαν οὐσίαν ἀποφαίνεται, τὸ δὲ δευτέρον ἐν ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ ὄντως ὄν, καὶ νοητὸν, τὰ εἶδη φησὶν εἶναι τὸ δὲ τρίτον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ ψυχικόν, μετὰ τὰ ἐνθ' καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν. *The first one he (i. e. Pythagoras) declares to be above being and essence: the second one, which is existence and intelligence, he says, is THE FORMS: and that the third one, which is animal, partakes of the first one, and of the forms.*

Nothing, in my humble opinion, can (in so small a compass) more compleatly explain the *Hermetic Trinity*, in the very sense I have understood it, than this does. Here is a *πρῶτον ἐν*, a *first one*, declared superior to all being and *essence*; because, as it hath been remarked above, *being* or *essence*

arises

<sup>a</sup> Ess. p. 125. *Simpl. in Phys. Arist.* fol. 50.

arises from *form*, and first matter is *without form*. For the same reason, the *second one* is called *essence* and *intelligence*; and the very name of, *the forms*, is here applied to him, which surely must put the matter out of dispute. From our author's account of this *second God*, it must evidently appear, that he was either unable, or unwilling to understand what he was about. The original is—Το δευτερον εν, οπερ εστι το οντως ον, και νοητον, τα ειναι φησιν εναυι—which he thus translates—"The second one, who " is existence itself, and intelligence, is called IDEA<sup>b</sup>." Τα ειναι, THE FORMS, in the *plural*, is according to him, IDEA (an image) in the *singular*! which, if compared with the language, and the intent of, the original, is neither sense nor grammar. He was, perhaps, under some private apprehensions, that if he left this multiform Deity in possession of the second place in this *Pythagorean Trinity*, all would be spoiled; because, then no man could be so absurd as to suspect a parallel between a God who is in-

C c 2

finitely

<sup>b</sup> P. 126. He is pleased once more to deliver this interpretation at p. 131.

finitely many, and the second person of the sacred Trinity, who is only one.

As for the *τρίτωνος* *ev*, or *third one*, it does not exactly answer in expression to the *ethereal Gods* above-mentioned, but in sense amounts to the same. It is the *soul of the world*, the *animal spirit* that bestows life, sense, and motion, upon all rational, animal, and vegetable beings: and what this is, we have already seen from many authorities (to which ten times as many more might soon be added) in the first chapter.

The last in order is the *Platonic Trinity*, which, instead of being more refined than the rest, as according to the extravagant opinion some men have conceived of *Plato*, it ought to be, rather seems to clinch the whole, and may, therefore, reasonably encourage us to suppose, that we have hit upon the true explanation of them all. *Plato*, says the author, “ in that treatise which  
“ he entitles *Timæus*, is the most copious  
“ on this head, and therein he speaks plainly  
“ of one sempiternal and unoriginated God;  
“ which God, says *Plato*, when he reasoned  
“ within himself about a future God, made  
“ this

Ἐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, γινώσκω διὰ τούτων ἔχει.



“ this universe, and placed this perfectly  
 “ happy God which he begat, as the *soul*  
 “ *in the middle of it* <sup>d</sup>.” The words *sem-*  
*piternal* and *unoriginated* have a pompous  
 sound ; but as we are certain that these phi-  
 losophers dignified the first matter of the  
 universe with these attributes, they are no-  
 thing but mere sounds without either sense  
 or meaning ; for whatever noise they make  
 with the attributes of *eternity*, *wisdom*,  
*goodness*, *perfection*, and the like ; yet, if  
 they bestowed these high appellations upon  
 a wrong object, upon that which *by nature*  
*is not God*, the most subtile reasonings in  
 the world cannot clear them from the odi-  
 ous imputation of having dishonoured that  
 God, whom we are told, *they did not like*  
*to retain in their knowledge* <sup>e</sup>. All that can  
 be done (or at least all that I have seen)  
 upon this occasion, is to presume in a grave  
 and solemn strain, that the wise Heathens  
 could not be so *absurd* as to over look the  
 power of a Creator, and ascribe divine in-  
 telligence to the dead elements of the world.  
 But this can amount to little or nothing ;  
 because, whether they were so absurd or  
 not,

<sup>d</sup> P. 127.

<sup>e</sup> Rom. i. 28.

not, is the very question in dispute, and nothing but their own expressions, compared with the character they bear in the sacred writings, must decide it.

But let us descend to a closer examination of *Plato's* words. This *sempiternal* and *un-originated* God, it seems, when he *reasoned within himself about a future God, made this universe*. The formation of the universe, therefore, was necessary to the existence of this *future God*. If to this be added, the residence of this *perfectly happy God*, who was *reasoned about* by the first, it must, I apprehend, at once dispel all farther doubts and difficulties. For when he was begotten, he was placed in this universe, as the *soul in the middle* of it. Now what is it that is placed in the *middle* of the universe, but the *light* in the orb of the *sun*, the first and chief of all the *forms* that emerged from the obscurity of primæval darkness? This is the soul *Plato* speaks of, and accordingly it is confessed by *Heraiscus* in *Damascius*, that the *sun*, here called the *soul in the middle*, is the *υβς νοητῆς* the *intelligent mind* of the world<sup>f</sup>. So that this *perfectly happy God* is,

after

<sup>f</sup> Bp. Cumb. *Ibid.* p. 282.

after all, nothing greater than the high and mighty *Cneph*, begotten out of sand and water. This is sufficient to give us a surfeit of *Plato's* Trinity, and, therefore, any farther account of it would be superfluous. But the *Essay-writer* thinks it "more for his purpose" to take this Trinity as delivered by *Porphry*, "who flourished about the time when the *consubstantial* doctrine of the Trinity began (as he calls it) to make a noise:" Which observation, though irreligiously worded, is yet in the main true enough; so true, that it will at once overturn all he has attempted to build upon it. This *Porphry* was an apostate from the *Christian* to the *Heathen* religion, and in his execrable writings, opposed that truth from which he had deserted, with the most implacable bitterness, even to a degree of madness; which principle encouraged him to draw up the opinion of *Plato* in the very terms made use of by the primitive Fathers to express the doctrine of the *sacred Trinity*; and it is plain, that his intent was, impudently to confront the *Christians* with this contemptible scrap of Paganism, dressed

up

up in their own expressions. The words of *Porphry* are these—*Αχει γαρ τριων υπο-  
 στασεων, εφη Πλατων, την τε δευ παρελθεν  
 οσιαν, &c.* “*Plato said, that the essence of  
 God is distinguished into three Hypostases,*”  
*&c.* *Plato* never said any such thing; he  
 never thought of defining his confused tri-  
 plicity by the terms *ουσια* and *υποστασις* pro-  
 perly applied and distinguished: and when  
 ornamented with this garb, it makes, I  
 think, a much worse appearance than it  
 did before, by assuming a character, which  
 it neither can, nor ever was intended to  
 support. So that *Porphry*, by his sense of  
 the *Platonic* Trinity, instead of betraying  
 the weakness of the consubstantial doctrine,  
 betrays nothing but his own want of judg-  
 ment. He has borrowed the most distin-  
 guished terms from the Christians of his  
 time, and by an injudicious application of  
 them, made that Trinity a consubstantial  
 one, which according to its original and  
 genuine acceptation, was never designed as  
 such.

Upon the whole then, there will be no  
 danger in granting, that “it is manifest (as  
 “our author asserts) beyond all controversy,



“ that both *Plato* and his disciples held a  
 “ kind of essential subordination to have  
 “ existed between these Gods<sup>b</sup> ;” for the  
 argument drawn from a comparison between  
 an heathen and the scriptural Trinity is so  
 inconsequential, that if he had instanced a  
 subordination in fifty more Trinities of the  
 like nature, it would not in the least ef-  
 fect the sense of this doctrine as maintained  
 by believers.

I shall, therefore, pursue this point no  
 farther, and ought to beg the reader's par-  
 don, for dwelling so long upon so dry a sub-  
 ject; but as it was pressed into the service of  
 heterodoxy, I thought it could not be amiss  
 to set this matter in that light, in which the  
 Pagans themselves appear to have seen it.  
 I am not ignorant, that many learned men  
 have put a very different construction upon  
 these articles of the heathen theology, and  
 have been so hardy as to apprehend without  
 the least ceremony, and, I believe, with as  
 little authority, that when the ancient phi-  
 losophers speak of their Gods and Dæmons,  
 they must mean the same as a believer does  
 by the true God, and the host of angels.

D d

This

This is a fact too well known to need any particular proof; but, however, let me, by way of specimen, exemplify this species of error, by producing an instance of it from the great *Bochart*; which, as this learned man was not less skilled in sacred than in prophane knowledge, is so much the more remarkable, and may serve to teach us, that before we venture to assert an agreement between the Pagans and the Bible in any article of moment, a proper degree of caution, even in the greatest men, is absolutely necessary.

*Santhoniatbo*, in his *Cosmogony*, after he has asserted his first dark principle of the universe, and a second God begotten of him by a self-concupiscence, sets down, in the third order, a sort of dæmons or intelligent animals, which he calls *Zophefemin*, spies or inspectors of the heavens, each of them formed in the shape of an egg, and generated from mud<sup>1</sup>; which *Zophefemin* are supposed by *Bochart*, to mean the celestial angels, the intelligent and real inhabitants of the invisible heavens. A criticism so evidently absurd and contrary to truth, that I shall

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. *Præp. Evan.* lib. 1. c. 10.

shall not undertake to disprove it; and the rather, because it is taken proper notice of by the learned bishop *Cumberland*\*.

This unaccountable fancy of searching for sacred truth amongst the writings of professed idolaters, hath had too many and too able advocates both ancient and modern; and though we ought not to suspect, that in all cases it proceeds from a very bad principle, yet can it seldom or never be referred to a very good one; and every attempt towards reconciling the sacred and prophane system, must be in general fruitless and unsatisfactory: for though it be granted, that upon

D d 2

the

\* The learned *Bochart* hath rightly given the original of the name *Zophesemim* from the Hebrew זופים, signifying *speculators* or *observers*, and שמים *heaven*; but he does violence to the author's whole text and scope; besides that he opposes *Eusebius*'s just reflection upon him, as not propounding the inhabitants of heaven, *i. e.* the angels, for Deities, when he interprets these *Zophesemim* to be angels. For how should angels be bred, as these are said to be, out of mud? How, when angels are so generated, shall the sun, moon, and stars, shine out? how shall angels be shaped like an egg, or in a roundish form? The truth is, his mind was prepossessed with Christian notions, and he vainly imagined that an *Heathen* must be so too. But *Sanchoniatho* meant only, that the celestial bodies are *intelligent*, and see what is done here below; and, therefore, were to be adored as Gods. *Remarks upon the Hist. of Sanch.* p. 21.



the rise and progress of idolatry after the flood, the most ancient Heathens carried off many sublime mysteries of the true religion, and purloined more in after ages from the people of God, yet when they were in possession of them, they mixed them up with their own muddy principles, then strained away the purer part of the mixture, and let it run to waste: so that if we now seek it again from them, there is little to be found but their own filthy sediments instead of it. And if in scattered fragments, borrowed from the *Hebrews*, there should be found some dark notices of the true God, yet, after all, we are not to form our sentiments from the Heathen theology, but to reform and correct that by the Christian.

---

### C H A P. VIII.

*His remarks upon the Athanasian and Nicene Creeds obviated.*

**T**HE intent of the essay-writer in these remarks is, to point out a few contradictions both in the language and in the



sense of these two Creeds, when compared either with themselves, or with each other. But, I fear, that whatever contradictions we shall meet with, they will at last prove to be nothing but the genuine produce of his own imagination. I will try the experiment, by setting down these remarks separately, and subjoining a reply to each of them.

Remark I. " The doctrine of *three Hypostases*, was not the doctrine of the council of *Nice*, but was afterwards adopted by some of the *Consubstantialists*, and was inserted in that Creed which goes under the name of *Athanasius*; but which could not possibly have been written by him, because he, as well as the rest of the *Nicene Fathers*, insisted upon it, that there was but *one Hypostasis* in the Trinity, any more than one *Usia* <sup>1</sup>."

His reason then for affirming that the Creed which goes under the name of *Athanasius*, could not possibly have been written by him, is, because he *insisted upon it*, that there was but *one Hypostasis* in the Trinity, any more than one *Usia*. In which, we have

have a slight specimen of the mendaciffimum for, on the contrary, *Athanasius* insisted upon it, that in the Trinity, there is one *Uſia* and three *Hypostases*: as a proof of which, the following instances will be esteemed sufficient. In his *questions*, we find these two, with their respective answers—How many essences do you confess in the Godhead? Ans. I confess ONE essence; one nature, &c. Qu. How many Hypostases do you confess in the Godhead? Ans. I confess THREE HYPOSTASES or Persons, &c.<sup>m</sup> And again, in his *dialogue* with a *Macedonian*, he says, Τὸς εὐαγγελιστοὶ καὶ ἡ παλαιὰ Διαθήκη οὐκ ἔνι τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις.<sup>n</sup> Hitherto you have been made to understand, that even the *Old Testament* declares for the doctrine of THREE *Hypostases*. It is likewise clear, that *Athanasius* never meant to confound the sense of these terms, so as to make them synonymous, because he has explained the one, *Hypostasis*, by προσωπον, person, and the other, *Uſia*, by φύσις, nature; which are as distinct in their significations, as any other terms whatever.

## II.

Ὁ ἐν τῷ θείῳ πνεύματι ὁμιλοῦν; Αἰ. Μία φύσις ἓν, μιαν φύσιν, &c. ΕΡ. Ὑποστάσεις δὲ πνεύματος ὁμιλοῦν ἐν τῷ θείῳ; Αἰ. Τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις ὁμιλοῦν, τρεῖς πρόσωπα, &c.  
V. II. p. 442.      <sup>n</sup> V. I. p. 223.

II. " *Socrates*, the ecclesiastical historian,  
 " says from *Iraneus*" (the *grammarian*, not  
 the *Father*) " that though the word *Hypo-*  
 " *stasis* was not used by the more ancient  
 " philosophers, yet, says he, you must un-  
 " derstand that the moderns make use of  
 " it instead of *ουσια* °."

*Socrates* does not speak of the *moderns*,  
 as intimating the *Christians*, but the modern  
*Greek* philosophers; and our business at pre-  
 sent is not with them, but with the inten-  
 tion of the *Nicene Fathers*.

III. " To say therefore that the three  
 " Persons in the Trinity are one *Ussia* and  
 " three *Hypostases*, is the same thing as to  
 " say, that they are *one substance* and *three*  
 " *substances* at the same time; which I take  
 " to be a contradiction in terms, and there-  
 " fore cannot be affirmed even of God him-  
 " self B."

No: it is the same thing as to say, that  
 they are *three Persons* and *one nature*; since  
*Athanasius* explains the word *Hypostasis* by  
*πρόσωπον*, *person*, and *Ussia* by *φύσις*, *nature*;  
 which is therefore so far from being a  
 contradiction in terms, that it is the very  
 thing



thing the church means to express and insist upon.

IV. " When it is said in the *Nicene*  
 " Creed, that the Son is *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ Πα-*  
 " *τρὸς*, of the substance of the Father, and  
 " that he is *ὁμοῦσι* τῷ Πατρὶ, of one  
 " substance with the Father — wherein does  
 " the difference consist? Why, in being  
 " said to be *three* substances at the same  
 " time that they are but *one* substance<sup>1</sup>."

It is not said, either in this place or any where else, that the Persons of the Trinity are *three substances*; but when a man is so violently heated with his own opinion, he can never attend to any thing but what he himself says. By the former of these expressions, we are to understand (as it is said in the Creed itself) that the Son was *γεννη-*  
*θέντα*, begotten, *ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας*, of or from the substance of the Father; and by the latter, that when so begotten, he was *ὁμοῦσι*, of the same substance, nature, or essence, with the Father, though a different Person from him. He may therefore, nay, and must surely, if he was begotten of the Father, be of the same essence or nature from which

he

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.



he was begotten, and yet, not be confounded in person with the Father : which was the heresy of *Sabellius*, who maintained that the Trinity was *μονοπροσωπον*, *i. e.* that it consisted of one Person numerically the same, but *τρισυμμεν*, distinguished by three different appellations.

V. “ I am very sensible that in our *English* translation of the Creed, commonly called the *Athanasian* Creed, we have followed the church of *Rome*, whose infallibility can give what sense it pleases to words, in rendering the word *Υποστασις*, by the *English* word *person*, that church having rendered it by the *Latin* word *persona*.”

*Athanasius*, *Epiphanius*, and all the *Greek* Fathers<sup>a</sup>, have metaphrased it by the *Greek* word *προσωπον*, *person*; and therefore we have not followed the church of *Rome*’s *Latin* word. This remark is succeeded by a long and most perplexed criticism upon the

<sup>a</sup> P. 138. *Υποστασις και προσωπον ταυτον εστι παρ’ αυτοις. Hypostasis & persona idem est apud illos. Sc. Patres. Leont. De Sect. p. 388. And Suidas affirms, that Υποστασις κατα την εκκλησιαστικην και αποστολικην παραδοσην εστι το προσωπον—Hypostasis, according to ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition, is the same with person.*

the different acceptations of the word *person*, as applied to *men* : which is all wide of the point ; because we have no concern either with its application to distinct and separate men, or to the same man considered in different capacities, but to the Godhead : and when thus applied, we know what we would mean by it, and scorn any low equivocations about it. This attempt upon the *words* whereby we express our faith, is no new thing : for whoever is in the least conversant with ecclesiastical antiquity, will find that the *Arians* always harboured the most implacable malice against them : for which, no other cause can be assigned, than that these terms, when applied so properly as they are in the Creeds, cut their heresy up by the roots—*hinc illæ lachrymæ* ! Nor did their wrath confine itself to the terms, but did likewise most amply exert itself against the *Nicene* Bishops, who, with others that embraced their sentiments, were looked upon by these gentlemen as nothing better than *fools* and *idiots* †, while themselves were the only wise and knowing amongst mankind.

VI. " I cannot help saying, it is something odd to have these two Creeds (the *Nicene* and *Athanasian*) established in the same church, in one of which those are declared to be accursed, who deny the Son to be of the same *Hypostasis* or *Ufia* with the Father; and in the other, it is declared *they cannot be saved*, who do not assert, that *there is one Hypostasis of the Father, and another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost*."

This seeming contradiction arises only from his confounding the words *υποστασις* and *ουσιον*: for though it be said, in the *anathema* annexed at the end of the *Nicene* Creed, that they are *accursed* who say that the Son is of *any other Hypostasis* or *Ufia* than of the Father, yet when it is considered, that the Son is of the *Hypostasis* in one sense, and of the *Ufia* in another, the *Athanasian* and *Nicene* Creeds are by no means at variance. Thus, the Son, as *God*, is of the Father's *Ufia*, and partakes of that divine nature or *essence*, from which he is generated: as a *Son*, he is begotten of the Father's *Hypostasis* or *Person*; which makes

E e 2

the



the contradiction vanish entirely; since it shews, that there may be three *Hypostasis* in the Godhead, as the *Athanasian* Creed sets forth; and that the Son may be begotten of the Father's *Hypostasis*, as it is asserted in the *Nicene*. But, even supposing his observation upon this *anathema* to be just, yet his suspicion of *oddness* in the establishment of the church is altogether groundless, since it is wholly omitted in that form of the *Nicene* Creed inserted in our *Book of Common Prayer*; and therefore it is weak to calumniate the Protestant church, for establishing what it hath never established at all.

These are all the remarks I thought it necessary to take any notice of. But the author of them, supposing they have put us into such disorder, that our only way is, to make a fair retreat, and give up the matter as unintelligible, bestows upon us the following sneer—"In order to obviate all  
 "these objections, it is thought sufficient  
 "by some, to say, that there are many  
 "powers in the divine nature, which human beings are not capable of comprehending."<sup>w</sup> But, with humble submission,



fion, this hath not been my way of *obviating these objections*: and though such a declamatory method would have spared me much trouble, yet have I endeavoured to set them all aside, by shewing that, in effect, there are no real objections either against the sense of a Trinity in Unity, or against the manner in which this doctrine is set forth in the Creeds. For whatever degree of humility and acquiescence is expected in relation to the articles of our faith, neither the scripture, nor the church-catholic requires us to believe that the Holy Trinity are one and three in *one and the same respect*; which would indeed be a most insuperable contradiction: but in the sense we hold it, it plainly appears, that there is none.

As for his frequent use of the name *Consubstantialists*, as if those, who believe a *consubstantial* Trinity, were some private party or sect of Christians dissenting from the truth—his charging us with following the *Pope's infallibility*—and his affirming with such confidence, that the *revelation of this wonderful doctrine came originally from the Papal chair*<sup>x</sup>—it is all a mere  
trick;

<sup>x</sup>P. 151.

trick; just the same with his comparing us to the *bigotted members of the church of Rome*, for regarding our ecclesiastical subscription, as all honest men and conscientious, who believe the articles of their faith, ought to regard it. For though in the holy scriptures it be not asserted *totidem literis*, that the Trinity is *consubstantial*, yet is it expressly declared, that *the Lord our God is ONE JEHOVAH*, and that *the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are ONE*, that is, one eternal nature, co-equal in majesty, wisdom, power, and every other attribute of essential divinity. At our baptism we are, after the ordinance of *Christ* our Lord, solemnly initiated into the faith of a Trinity in Unity—The inspired Apostles, and from them the church-catholic, pronounce their blessings in strict conformity with this faith, as the High Priest, on the day of the great yearly attonement, did upon the *Israelites* by a threefold repetition of the name *Jehovah*<sup>y</sup>; and the two Testaments, as hath been shewn, abound with the revelation of this divine mystery.

It

<sup>y</sup> Numb. vi. 24.

It is therefore, without all controversy, a scriptural truth, that the Godhead is *ONE*, and that in this Godhead there are *Three Persons* : and if the *author* can devise any method of expressing their *unity* more fully and more sensibly than by the word *consubstantial*, let him advance it : but to represent the whole as of no higher an original than the *Papal chair*, when even the very word *consubstantial* was not borrowed from thence, is to betray the weakness of his own cause, and offer an affront to the common sense of every *Protestant* Christian.

Another method he takes of blending this doctrine and Popery together, is by observing, that “ when the *Protestants* argue against “ the doctrine of *transubstantiation*, the *Papists* never fail objecting the equal incredibility of a *consubstantial* Trinity \*.” This is very true : but a *Protestant* is not bound to answer for the indiscretion of a *Papist*, in putting the doctrine of a *consubstantial* Trinity upon a level with a *transubstantiation* of the sacramental elements : and a parallel between these two doctrines cannot possibly turn out to the disadvantage of the former, since

\* Ibid.

since the one is subjected to the scrutiny of our senses, and contradicts them; the other is above our senses, and does not. If indeed he rejects the mystery of a Trinity in Unity, because he is pleased to think it *incredible*, the argument drawn from hence carries with it no more weight than that of a bad example: for the question to be decided, is not, whether *he* believes this doctrine, since thousands beside him have disbelieved it, but whether it is revealed in the holy scriptures; of which, not a single *Iota* could be affected by the disbelief of the whole world. *For what if some do not believe? shall their unbelief make the word of God without effect? God forbid! yea, let God be true, but every man (that opposes him) a liar.*

F I N I S.

6 JY 59